arXiv:1610.06026v1 [math.ST] 19 Oct 2016

Least squares estimation in the monotone single index model

Fadoua Balabdaoui, Cécile Durot and Hanna Jankowski

Université Paris-Dauphine
PSL Research University
CNRS, CEREMADE
75016 Paris, France
e-mail: fadoua@ceremade.dauphine.fr

Seminar für Statistik
ETH Zürich
8092, Zürich, Schweiz
e-mail: fadoua@ceremade.dauphine.fr

Université Paris Nanterre
Modal'x
200 avenue de la république
92001 Nanterre Cedex, France
e-mail: cecile.durot@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
York University
4700 Keele Street
Toronto ON, M3J 1P3, Canada
e-mail: hkj@yorku.ca

Abstract: . We study the monotone single index model where a real response variable Y is linked to a d-dimensional covariate X through the relationship $E[Y|X] = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)$ almost surely. Both the ridge function, Ψ_0, and the index parameter, α_0, are unknown and the ridge function is assumed to be monotone on its interval of support. Under some regularity conditions, without imposing a particular distribution on the regression error, we show the $n^{-1/3}$ rate of convergence in the ℓ_2-norm for the least squares estimator of the bundled function $\psi_0(\alpha_0^T \cdot)$, and also that of the ridge function and the index separately. Furthermore, we show that the least squares estimator is nearly parametrically rate-adaptive to piecewise constant ridge functions.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62G08, 62G20; secondary 62J12.
Keywords and phrases: least squares, maximum likelihood, monotone, semi-parametric, shape-constraints, single-index model.

1. Introduction

1.1. The generalized linear model and the single index model

The generalized linear model is widely used in econometrics and biometrics as a standard tool in parametric regression analysis, see *e.g.* Dobson and Barnett (2008), and can be described as follows. Let n be the size of a sample of individuals randomly selected from some population. For each individual $i = 1, \ldots, n$, a response variable and a d-dimensional vector of covariates have been measured. The observations are assumed to be independent copies of a pair (X, Y) such that

$$E(Y|X) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X) \tag{1.1}$$

almost surely with an unknown index $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \backslash \{0\}$ and a monotone ridge function Ψ_0, also called the inverse link function. Here, α_0 is unknown whereas Ψ_0 is assumed to be known. In

the generalized linear model, the conditional density of Y given $X = x$ with respect to a given dominating measure (typically either Lebesgue measure or a counting measure) is assumed to take the form

$$y \mapsto h(y, \phi) \exp\left\{ \frac{y\ell(\mu(x)) - B \circ \ell(\mu(x))}{\phi} \right\} \tag{1.2}$$

where h is a normalizing function, $\mu(x)$ is the mean, $\phi > 0$ is a possibly unknown dispersion parameter, ℓ is a given real valued function with first derivative $\ell' > 0$, and inverse $\ell^{-1} = B'$. The generalized linear model includes of course the Gaussian linear model, which is arguably the most popular parametric regression model. In this model, the conditional distribution function of Y given X is Gaussian with an unknown variance σ^2 independent of X and expectation $E(Y|X) = \alpha_0^T X$ for an unknown vector α_0. Here, $\phi = \sigma^2$ and both ℓ and Ψ_0 are the identity function on $\mathbb{R}$. The generalized linear model covers a number of other popular parametric regression models such as the Poisson model, and logit and probit models for Binomial observations. Although popular, parametric models lack the flexibility offered by more robust approaches.

The single index model can be viewed as an attempt at extending the generalized linear one with the aim of gaining more flexibility. It is widely used, for instance in econometrics, as a compromise between too restrictive parametric assumptions and a fully non parametric setting. Fully non-parametric models can suffer from the "curse of dimensionality" in high-dimensional problems. In contrast, the single index model assumes that the conditional expectation of Y given X depends only on the linear combination $\alpha_0^T X$ (the linear predictor) of the components of X. This means that similar as above, the conditional expectation of Y given X takes the form $E(Y|X) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)$ almost surely, but now, the ridge function Ψ_0 is unknown. Furthermore, it is no longer assumed that the conditional distribution of Y given X belongs to a given exponential family, making the model even more flexible, and robust to assumption misspecification.

Standard methods for estimating α_0 and Ψ_0 rely on smoothness assumptions on Ψ_0, and hence involve a smoothing parameter which has to be carefully chosen, see *e.g.* Härdle et al. (1993), Chiou and Müller (2004), Hristache et al. (2001) and references therein. Note that α_0 and Ψ_0 are not identifiable if left unrestricted. To see this, let $\|\alpha_0\|$ denote the Euclidean norm of α_0, $\beta_0 = \alpha_0/\|\alpha_0\|$ and $\Phi_0(t) = \Psi_0(\|\alpha_0\|t)$ for all t. Then, we have $E(Y|X) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X) = \Phi_0(\beta_0^T X)$ almost surely. We obtain the same equalities by considering $\beta_0 = -\alpha_0$ and $\Phi_0(t) = \Psi_0(-t)$ for all t. This issue could be resolved by assuming *e.g.* that $\|\alpha_0\| = 1$ and the first non-null entry of α_0 is positive. Additional constraints may be also imposed on Ψ_0 and the distribution of the covariate X in order to ensure identifiability.

1.2. The monotone single index model

In this paper, we are interested in the single index model where the unknown ridge function is assumed to be monotone. This is motivated by the fact that monotonicity appears naturally in various applications, which is one of the reasons behind the popularity of the generalized linear model. We follow a non-parametric estimation approach which does not require a smoothing parameter. Precisely, we assume (1.1) where $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \backslash \{0\}$ is such that $\|\alpha_0\| = 1$, and Ψ_0 is assumed to be *non-decreasing*. The latter assumption can be made without loss of generality since changing α_0 into $-\alpha_0$ changes automatically the monotonicity direction of Ψ_0. Furthermore, we do no make any specific assumption about the conditional distribution of Y given X, thereby avoiding model misspecification. Throughout this paper, we will refer to this model as the monotone single index model, a term that has been already used in the literature.

The monotone single index model, with the additional assumption that $Y - E(Y|X)$ is independent of X, has been considered by Foster et al. (2013), where an estimator for α_0 was proposed

based on combining isotonic regression with a smoothing method (which involves a tuning parameter), and also by Kakade et al. (2011), where an algorithm for simultaneously estimating the index and the ridge function is provided under the assumption that the ridge function is Lipschitz (the Lipschitz constant is a parameter of the algorithm). It enters the setting of Han (1987) with (using the notation of that paper) $F(x,u) = f(x) + u$ and $D(t) = t$ with f a monotone function. In the general setting they consider, Han (1987) prove consistency of a non-parametric estimator for the index that does not require any tuning parameter. The monotone single index model is also closely related to the model considered by Chen and Samworth (2016), who, in contrast to the approach followed here, assume that the conditional distribution of the response variable given the predictor vector belongs to a given exponential family. Another difference is that the authors consider a more general assumption on the conditional expectation. Indeed, they allow the conditional expectation of Y given X to depend on several linear predictors: with ℓ taken from (1.2), $\ell(E(Y|X))$ can be written as a sum of ridge functions of the linear predictors, where each ridge function satisfies a different shape constraint such as monotonicity, convexity, or linearity. The authors show consistency for a slightly modified maximum likelihood estimator, which is obtained by maximizing the likelihood over *the closure* of the set of all possible parameters.

We also point out that the monotone single index model covers the problem of current status regression, in which the response $Y \geqslant 0$ is not completely observed. Instead, independent copies of (X, C, Δ) are observed where $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the predictor, $C \geqslant 0$ is an observed censoring time independent of Y, and $\Delta = 1_{\{Y \leqslant C\}}$ Although non-observed, Y is assumed to satisfy the linear regression model $Y = \alpha_0^T X + \varepsilon$ where $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and ε is independent of (C, X) with unknown distribution function F_0. Let $\tilde{X}$ denote the random vector in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ such that $\tilde{X}^T = (C, X^T)$, $\tilde{\alpha}_0$ the vector in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_0^T = (1, -\alpha_0^T)$ and $\tilde{Y} = \Delta$. Then, we have $E(\tilde{Y}|\tilde{X}) = F_0(\tilde{\alpha}_0^T \tilde{X})$ where F_0 is non-decreasing (since it is a distribution function). Here, the conditional distribution of $\tilde{Y}$ given $\tilde{X}$ is Bernoulli, with density function (with respect to the counting measure on $\{0,1\}$) given by (1.2) where ℓ is the logit function $\ell(\mu) = \log(\mu/(1-\mu))$ for $\mu \in (0,1)$. Note that in the particular case where the censoring time $C \equiv 0$ is degenerate has been widely used in econometrics and is usually referred to as the binary choice model. The maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of α_0 was proved to be consistent by Cosslett (1983), and Murphy et al. (1999) prove that the rate of convergence is $O(n^{-1/3})$ in the one-dimensional case (that is, when $d = 1$). The latter paper also proves that an appropriately penalized MLE is $\sqrt{n}$-consistent but the considered estimator is difficult to implement. Groeneboom and Hendrickx (2016) consider several alternative $\sqrt{n}$-consistent estimators based on a truncated likelihood, where the truncation parameter has to be chosen by the practitioner.

1.3. Contents of the paper

In the monotone single index model, we consider the least squares estimator which aims at estimating both the index and ridge function without choosing a tuning parameter. We give a characterization of the least-squares estimator (LSE) of (Ψ_0, α_0) under the monotonicity constraint using a profiling approach. Furthermore, letting $g_0(x) = E(Y|X = x) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)$ the regression function, we prove that under appropriate conditions the LSE of g_0 converges at a $n^{1/3}$-rate in the L_2-sense. Then, we consider the LSE of α_0 and Ψ_0 separately and prove their $n^{1/3}$-consistency. The $n^{1/3}$-rate of convergence that we obtain for the LSE of the parametric index, α_0, may be due to our strategy of proof, as we derive this rate from the $n^{1/3}$-rate of the LSE of g_0. Thus, it is not excluded that sharper rates could be obtained using alternative methods. This is however out of the scope of this work. For the sake of completeness, we devote a small section to the maximum likelihood estimators (MLE) under the assumption that the conditional distribution of Y given X belongs to a given exponential family. Here, we maximize the likelihood over

the set of all possible parameters in contrast to the approach followed by Chen and Samworth (2016), where maximization is performed over the closure of that set. We prove existence of the MLE and give a characterization thereof but we chose not to pursue further investigations on this estimator: we prefer using a more robust estimator like the LSE, which does not require specific assumptions on the conditional distribution of the response variable given the predictor.

Furthermore, we also study the adaptive properties of our LSE approach. Shape-constrained methods are well-known to be naturally adaptive. See, for example, van de Geer (1993, 2000); Chatterjee et al. (2015); Han and Wellner (2016). Following Chatterjee et al. (2015), we study the global convergence rate when the truth Ψ_0 is piecewise constant. In Theorem 4.2, we show that the rate of convergence of g_0 in this case is nearly parametric.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sections 2 and 3, we show existence of the LSE and MLE of (Ψ_0, α_0) and give a characterization of the estimators. Our main result is given in Theorem 4.1 of Section 4, where we establish the $n^{1/3}$-convergence rate of the LSE of the bundled regression function $g_0(\cdot) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T \cdot)$. In Section 5, we show under some specified assumptions that the LSE of α_0 and Ψ_0 converge separately at the same rate in the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and the L_2-norm on the set of real valued functions respectively, provided that we restrict integration to a bounded subset of the domain of Ψ_0. Section 4 also gives the adaptive rates of convergence for the LSE. The proof of the main Theorem 4.1 is given in Section 6. The proof of Theorem 4.2 as well as some additional proofs are given in an Appendix in the Supplementary Material.

2. Existence and characterization of the least squares estimator

Assume that we observe an i.i.d. n-sample from (X, Y) such that $E(Y|X) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)$ almost surely, where both the index α_0 and the monotone ridge function Ψ_0 are unknown. For identifiability purposes, as explained in the introduction, α_0 is assumed to belong to the d-dimensional unit Euclidean sphere denoted by $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, whereas Ψ_0 is assumed to be non-decreasing on its domain, which contains the range of the linear predictor $\alpha_0^T X$. Assume that we have m distinct data points $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and denote $Y_i = n_i^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{ij}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$, where n_i is the number of observations at the data point X_i and $Y_{i1}, Y_{i2}, \ldots, Y_{in_i}$ are the corresponding response variables. Hence, $n = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i$.

The goal is to find the LSE of (Ψ_0, α_0), the minimizer of the least-squares criterion

$$h_n(\Psi, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i \left\{ Y_i - \Psi(\alpha^T X_i) \right\}^2$$

over $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, where $\mathcal{M}$ is the class of all non-decreasing functions on $\mathbb{R}$. Using the profiled least-squares approach, we first consider the problem of minimizing $\Psi \mapsto h_n(\Psi, \alpha)$ over $\mathcal{M}$ for a fixed $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, then plug the obtained minimizer $\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha$ in the criterion. Finally, we minimize $\alpha \mapsto h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha, \alpha)$ over $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. Denoting the minimizer by $\widehat{\alpha}_n$, the minimum of $h_n(\Psi, \alpha)$ is then achieved at $(\widehat{\alpha}_n, \widehat{\Psi}_n)$ where $\widehat{\Psi}_n = \widehat{\Psi}_n^{\widehat{\alpha}_n}$, whence $(\widehat{\alpha}_n, \widehat{\Psi}_n)$ is the (non unique) LSE. In the following, we discuss precisely the way in which the LSE is non-unique, the algorithm to compute it, as well as existence.

First consider the problem of minimizing $\Psi \mapsto h_n(\Psi, \alpha)$ over $\mathcal{M}$ for a fixed $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. For this task, order the observations based on the values of the linear predictors $\alpha^T X_i$'s corresponding to α. Ties may occur in the sense that we may have $\alpha^T X_i = \alpha^T X_j$ for $i \neq j$, so we denote by m_α the number of distinct values, and by $Z_1^\alpha < \ldots < Z_{m_\alpha}^\alpha$ the distinct ordered statistics of $\alpha^T X_1, \ldots, \alpha^T X_m$. Hence, we have $m_\alpha \leqslant m$ with an equality in the case of no ties. Then, with

$$n_k^\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i \mathbb{I}_{\alpha^T X_i = Z_k^\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_k^\alpha = \frac{1}{n_k^\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^m n_i Y_i \mathbb{I}_{\alpha^T X_i = Z_k^\alpha},$$

we have

$$h_n(\Psi,\alpha)=\sum_{k=1}^{m_\alpha} n_k^\alpha \left\{Y_k^\alpha-\Psi(Z_k^\alpha)\right\}^2+\sum_{i=1}^{m} n_i Y_i^2-\sum_{k=1}^{m_\alpha} n_k^\alpha (Y_k^\alpha)^2. \tag{2.3}$$

This means that minimizing $h_n(\Psi,\alpha)$ with respect to Ψ amounts to minimizing

$$\Psi\mapsto\sum_{k=1}^{m_\alpha} n_k^\alpha \left\{Y_k^\alpha-\Psi(Z_k^\alpha)\right\}^2$$

over $\mathcal{M}$, which in turn amounts to minimizing $\sum_{k=1}^{m_\alpha} n_k^\alpha \left\{Y_k^\alpha-\eta_k\right\}^2$ over the set of all real numbers $\eta_1\leqslant\cdots\leqslant\eta_{m_\alpha}$, where we set $\eta_k=\Psi(Z_k^\alpha)$. It is a standard fact in isotonic regression (see *e.g.* Theorem 1.1 in Barlow et al. (1972)) that the minimum is achieved and that $(\eta_1,\ldots,\eta_{m_\alpha})$ is a minimizer if, and only if $\eta_k=\widehat{d}_k^\alpha$ for all $k=1,\ldots,m_\alpha$, where $\widehat{d}_1^\alpha\leqslant\ldots\leqslant\widehat{d}_{m_\alpha}^\alpha$ are equal to the left derivatives of the greatest convex minorant of the cumulative sum diagram defined by the set of points

$$\left\{(0,0),\left(\sum_{j=1}^{i} n_j^\alpha,\sum_{j=1}^{i} n_j^\alpha Y_j^\alpha\right),i=1,\ldots,m_\alpha\right\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Hence, the minimum of $\Psi\mapsto h_n(\Psi,\alpha)$ over $\mathcal{M}$ is achieved at a non-decreasing $\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha$ if and only if for all $i=1,\ldots,m_\alpha$,

$$\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha(Z_i^\alpha)=\widehat{d}_i^\alpha. \tag{2.5}$$

The solution is not unique, but is uniquely defined at the points Z_i^α.

Next, we search for $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ that minimizes $\widehat{h}_n(\alpha):=h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha,\alpha)$ over $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. The following proposition, which is proved in Subsection 8.1 of the Supplement, shows that the optimization problem can be reduced to minimizing the above function over $\mathcal{S}^X$, the set of all $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ such that $\alpha^TX_i\neq\alpha^TX_j$ for all $i\neq j$.

Proposition 2.1. *We have* $\inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{S}_{d-1}} h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha,\alpha)=\inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{S}^X} h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha,\alpha)$.

Now for all $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}^X$, we have $m_\alpha=m$ and there exists an ordering (*i.e.* a permutation on $\{1,\ldots,m\}$) π_α induced by α such that $\alpha^TX_{\pi_\alpha(1)}<\cdots<\alpha^TX_{\pi_\alpha(m)}$, and we have

$$h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha,\alpha)=\sum_{k=1}^{m} n_k^\alpha\left\{Y_k^\alpha-\widehat{d}_k^\alpha\right\}^2 \tag{2.6}$$

for all $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}^X$. This depends only on the ordering induced by α (and on the observations). As the number of inducible orderings is finite, minimizing $\widehat{h}_n$ over $\mathcal{S}^X$ hence amounts at minimizing $\widehat{h}_n$ over a finite set, so that the minimum is achieved. This means that there exists a (non-unique) $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ that minimizes $\widehat{h}_n(\alpha)$ over $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, and such that $m_{\widehat{\alpha}_n}=m$.

We conclude the section by a short comment on how to implement the LSE $(\widehat{\alpha}_n,\widehat{\Psi}_n)$. We point out that from the above characterization, it follows that the LSE is not unique. Let $\mathcal{P}^X$ be the set of all inducible orderings, that is the set of all permutations π on $\{1,\ldots,m\}$ such that there exist $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ that induces π, *i.e.* that satisfies $\alpha^TX_{\pi(1)}<\cdots<\alpha^TX_{\pi(m)}$. For each $\pi\in\mathcal{P}^X$, compute the left derivatives $d_1^\pi\leqslant\ldots\leqslant d_m^\pi$ of the greatest convex minorant of the cumulative sum diagram defined by the set of points

$$\left\{(0,0),\left(\sum_{j=1}^{i} n_{\pi(j)},\sum_{j=1}^{i} n_{\pi(j)}Y_{\pi(j)}\right),i=1,\ldots,m\right\}$$

using the pool adjacent violator algorithm (PAVA) or a similar device, see Barlow et al. (1972) for a precise description of the algorithm. Then choose $\widehat{\pi}_n$ that minimizes $\sum_{k=1}^m n_{\pi(k)} \left\{Y_{\pi(k)} - d_k^\pi\right\}^2$ over $\pi \in \mathcal{P}^X$. The above characterization shows that $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ is any index in $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ that induces $\widehat{\pi}_n$, and $\widehat{\Psi}_n$ is any non-decreasing function that satisfies $\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X_{\widehat{\pi}_n(i)}) = d_i^{\widehat{\pi}_n}$ for all i.

The difficulty with the above line of implementation is that it requires that the set of all inducible orderings be computable. One can check that the number of inducible orderings is on the order of $m^{2(d-1)}$, see Cover (1967). Also, given an inducible ordering, it is not easy to compute the set of corresponding inducing indices in $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ in $d > 2$. As we are not aware of an efficient algorithm to solve those problems, we suggest instead of using inducible orderings to estimate $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ using a stochastic search as done in Chen and Samworth (2016).

3. Existence and characterization of the maximum likelihood estimator

Similar to Section 2, we observe an i.i.d. n-sample from (X, Y) such that $E(Y|X) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)$ almost surely, where both the index $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ and the non-decreasing ridge function Ψ_0 are unknown. We are now interested in the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of (Ψ_0, α_0) assuming that with respect to some dominating measure, the conditional distribution of Y given $X = x$ has a density of the form (1.2) where $\mu(x)$ is the mean that belongs to a given interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, ℓ is a real valued function with a strictly positive first derivative on (a, b), $\phi > 0$ is a dispersion parameter, and h is a normalizing function. Here, a and/or b could be infinite.

If $P(Y = a|X) > 0$, we assume that $a\ell(\eta) - B \circ \ell(\eta)$ converges to a finite limit as $\eta \downarrow a$. Similarly, if $P(Y = b|X) > 0$, we assume that $b\ell(\eta) - B \circ \ell(\eta)$ converges to a finite limit as $\eta \uparrow b$. Note that these additional assumptions are satisfied in popular discrete models such as the binomial model (where conditionally on $X = x$, kY is a binomial variable with parameters k and $k\mu(x)$) and the Poisson model (where conditionally on $X = x$, Y has a Poisson distribution). Assume, furthermore, that $Y \in [a, b]$.

The goal is to find the MLE of (Ψ_0, α_0), if it exists. Using the same notation as in Section 2, this amounts to minimizing

$$\ell_n(\Psi, \alpha) \quad := \quad -\sum_{i=1}^m n_i \left\{Y_i \ell[\Psi(\alpha^T X_i)] - B \circ \ell[\Psi(\alpha^T X_i)]\right\}$$

over $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. Using the profiled likelihood approach, we first minimize $\Psi \mapsto \ell_n(\Psi, \alpha)$ over $\mathcal{M}$ for arbitrary fixed $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. An interesting fact is that the minimum is achieved at those functions Ψ that minimize the least squares criterion $h_n(\,.\,, \alpha)$ (and only at these ones). Considering the characterization that we obtain for the minimizers of the least squares criterion, this can be formulated as follows (see Section 8.2 in the Supplement for a proof).

Proposition 3.1. *Under the above assumptions, for all fixed $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, $\ell_n(\Psi, \alpha)$ attains its minimum over $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}$. Moreover, a function $\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ is a minimizer if, and only if, it satisfies (2.5) for all $i = 1, \ldots, m_\alpha$.*

Next, we search for a minimizer of $\widehat{\ell}_n(\alpha) := \ell_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha, \alpha)$ over $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. Similar to Proposition 2.1, it can be proved that the minimum of $\widehat{\ell}_n$ over $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ is equal to the minimum over $\mathcal{S}^X$. Then, similarly to the case of the least squares criterion, one concludes that the minimum can be reduced to the minimum over a finite set, and hence is achieved. Denoting by $\tilde{\alpha}_n$ a minimizer, we conclude that $(\widehat{\Psi}_n^{\tilde{\alpha}_n}, \tilde{\alpha}_n)$ is a MLE of (Ψ_0, α_0). Similar to the LSE, it is not unique and can be computed by combining PAVA with a stochastic search.

The above results for the MLE compare to results obtained by Chen and Samworth (2016) in a more general model. Specializing the model they consider to the current model, their results

show existence and give a characterization, for estimators of $f_0 = \ell \circ \Psi_0$ and α_0, where ℓ is taken from (1.2). Because ℓ is strictly increasing, estimating f_0 is equivalent to estimating Ψ_0. When estimating f_0, one may encounter estimators which take infinite values: whereas the MLE $\tilde{\Psi}_n$ of Ψ_0 always takes finite values (as can be seen from the preceding characterization), it may happen that the MLE $\ell \circ \tilde{\Psi}_n$ of f_0 takes infinite values. To give a simple example, assume that the conditional distribution of Y given X is Bernoulli, and that the observations are such that the corresponding MLE of Ψ_0 satisfies $\inf_t \tilde{\Psi}_n(t) = 0$. Since in this case ℓ is the logit function, we have $\ell(\eta) \to -\infty$ as $\eta \to 0$ so that the MLE of f_0 takes an infinite value in this situation. To handle this technicality, Chen and Samworth (2016) must estimate (f_0, α_0) by maximizing a criterion over the *closure* of the set of all possible parameters. This may offer advantages in the complex model they consider, but for our setting, it is more natural to estimate (Ψ_0, α_0) instead of (f_0, α_0).

We also point out that the LSE is a natural alternative to the MLE. Although for any fixed α, the minimizers of $h_n(\,.\,, \alpha)$ coincide with the minimizers of $\ell_n(\,.\,, \alpha)$, the MLE and the LSE of (Ψ_0, α_0) do not necessarily coincide, except of course in the Gaussian case. On the other hand, the MLE is appropriate only if the assumption of an exponential family of distributions is valid. However, the LSE is appropriate independently of any assumption on the conditional distribution of Y given X. Hence, the LSE is more robust, and this is the estimator we focus on in the rest of this paper. In particular, we no longer assume that the conditional distributions come from an exponential family.

4. Convergence of the LSE for the regression function

We consider the same setting as in Section 2, however, we now also assume that X has a continuous distribution. This means that we observe an i.i.d. n-sample $(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n$ from a pair (X, Y) where with probability one, all the X_i's are different from each other (hence, in the notation of Section 2, $n = m$ and $n_i = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$). It is assumed that $E(Y|X) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)$ almost surely, where both the index α_0 and the monotone ridge function Ψ_0 are unknown, so the regression function is defined by

$$g_0(x) = \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x) \tag{4.7}$$

for (almost-) all x in the support of X and its least-squares estimator (LSE) is given by

$$\widehat{g}_n(x) = \widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) \tag{4.8}$$

for (almost-) all x in the support of X, where $(\widehat{\Psi}_n, \widehat{\alpha}_n)$ is the LSE of (Ψ_0, α_0) studied in Section 2: $(\widehat{\Psi}_n, \widehat{\alpha}_n)$ minimizes

$$h_n(\Psi, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ Y_i - \Psi(\alpha^T X_i) \right\}^2$$

over $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. For convenience, we consider below a solution $\widehat{\Psi}_n$ that is left-hand continuous and piecewise constant, and that can jump only at the points $\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X_i$ (but not necessarily all), for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Hence, $\widehat{\psi}_n$ is uniquely defined whereas $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ is not unique ($\widehat{\alpha}_n$ denotes an arbitrary minimizer of $\widehat{h}_n$, in the notation of Section 2). In this section, we are interested in the consistency and rate of convergence of $\widehat{g}_n$ in the L_2-sense.

4.1. The rate of convergence

We begin with some notation and assumptions. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the support of the random vector of covariate X. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the joint distribution of (X, Y), $\mathbb{P}_x$ the conditional distribution of Y given

$X = x$, and $\mathbb{Q}$ the marginal distribution of X. Theorem 4.1 below will be established under the following assumptions.

A1. $\mathcal{X}$ is a bounded convex set,

A2. there exists a constant $K_0 > 0$ such that $|g_0(x)| \leqslant K_0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

A3. there exist constants $a_0 > 0$ and $M > 0$ such that for all integers $s \geqslant 2$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\int |y|^s d\mathbb{P}_x(y) \leqslant a_0 s! M^{s-2}, \tag{4.9}$$

A4. the distribution $\mathbb{Q}$ admits a density q with respect to Lebesgue measure and there exist constants $\underline{q} > 0, \bar{q} > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\underline{q} \leqslant q(x) \leqslant \bar{q} \tag{4.10}$$

Assumption A1 ensures that for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, the set $\{\alpha^T x,\ x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, which is the support of the linear predictor $\alpha^T X$ corresponding to α, is convex (*i.e.* is an interval). Hence, we consider functions of the form $\Psi(\alpha^T X)$ where $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ and Ψ is a non-decreasing function on its interval of support $\{\alpha^T x,\ x \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Assumption A3 ensures that conditionally on $X = x$, the response variable Y is uniformly integrable in x. This assumption is clearly satisfied if Y is a bounded random variable. It is also satisfied if the conditional distribution of Y given X belongs to an exponential familly, see Proposition 8.1 in Appendix 8.6 for more details.

Assumption A4 makes L_2-distances with respect to the probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ and Lebesgue measure equivalent. Also, certain arguments in the entropy calculations below can be given in slightly simpler form using Lebesgue measure. Therefore, we have opted for the L_2-distance with respect to this measure while computing bounds for the estimation error associated with the LSE.

Theorem 4.1. *With g_0 and $\widehat{g}_n$ defined by (4.7) and (4.8) respectively, under assumptions A1-A4 above we have*

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} = O_p(n^{-1/3}).$$

On the other hand, when the truth is piecewise constant, we can show that the rate of convergence is much faster.

Theorem 4.2. *Under assumptions A1-A4 and assuming that Ψ_0 an increasing piecewise constant function where κ denotes the number of unique values taken by Ψ_0, we have*

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} = O_p\left((n/\kappa)^{-1/2} (\log n)^{3/2} \right).$$

The proofs of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 are similar to each other. For this reason, we present in the next Section the main steps and technical difficulties encountered in proving Theorem 4.1, while a complete proof of Theorem 4.2 is given in Appendix A (Section 7 in the Supplement).

Remark 4.3. *To our best knowledge, the first adaptive results for the Grenander estimator appear in Groeneboom and Pyke (1983), where the asymptotic distribution is obtained exactly. Later, van de Geer (1993) showed how the same rate of convergence can be obtained via empirical process arguments using local entropy bounds. Specficially, in van de Geer (1993) it is shown that the MLE of a decreasing density converges at rate $n^{-1/2}(\log n)^{1/2}$ in Hellinger distance when the true density is uniform. More recently, risk bounds were developed for isotonic regression by*

Chatterjee et al. (2015), who obtain the same rate in the L_2 norm. Similar (nearly parametric) results were found in Han and Wellner (2016) for the multivariate convex bounded *LSE when the truth is a polyhedral functions supported on a polytopal region for $d \leqslant 4$.*

4.2. The main steps of the proof of Theorem 4.1

We will consider monotone functions with various intervals of support with the aim of comparing them in a specific sense. For more convenience, we will extend each considered function outside its actual support by taking the extension to be constant to the left and right of the end points of that support. Depending on the context at hand, we will either consider extension to the whole real line, or an extension to a bounded interval that will contain the support of all monotone functions involved.

By definition of the LSE, $\widehat{g}_n$ maximizes the criterion

$$\mathbb{M}_n g \quad := \quad \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big\{Y_i g(X_i) - \frac{g(X_i)^2}{2}\Big\} \tag{4.11}$$

over the set of all functions g of the form $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x), x \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}$. It would have been easier to prove Theorem 4.1 using standard results from empirical process theory if the LSE were known to be bounded in probability by some constant which is independent of n. Unfortunately, we do not know whether this holds true. Instead, the following lemma can be established (see Subection 6.1 for a proof).

Lemma 4.4. *We have*

$$\min_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n} Y_k \leqslant \widehat{g}_n(x) \leqslant \max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n} Y_k \tag{4.12}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, under assumptions A2 and A3 we have

$$\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} |\widehat{g}_n(x)| \quad \leqslant \quad \max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n} |Y_k| \quad = \quad O_p(\log n).$$

Note that under the more restrictive assumption that Y is a bounded random variable (so that $\max_k |Y_k|$ is bounded), we obtain that $\widehat{g}_n$ is also bounded. This is the case for instance in the current status model which, as explained in the introduction, is a special case of the model we consider with $Y \in \{0, 1\}$. For this reason, the arguments developed in Groeneboom and Hendrickx (2016) in the current status model cannot be directly adapted to our setting.

Now it follows from Lemma 4.4 that, with arbitrarily large probability, $\widehat{g}_n$ maximizes $\mathbb{M}_n g$ over the set of all functions g that are bounded in absolute value by $C \log n$ for some appropriately chosen $C > 0$, and take the form $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x), x \in \mathcal{X}$ with $(\alpha, \Psi) \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1} \times \mathcal{M}$. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_n$ the empirical distribution corresponding to $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$, and let $\widehat{f}_n(x, y) = y\widehat{g}_n(x) - \widehat{g}_n^2(x)/2$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\mathbb{M}_n g = \mathbb{P}_n f$ with

$$f(x, y) = yg(x) - g^2(x)/2 \tag{4.13}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathbb{R}$, this means that, with arbitrarily large probability, $\widehat{f}_n$ maximizes $\mathbb{P}_n f$ over the set of all functions f of the form (4.13) for some function g that is bounded in absolute value by $C \log n$ and takes the form $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x), x \in \mathcal{X}$ with $(\alpha, \Psi) \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1} \times \mathcal{M}$. Hence, classical arguments for maximizers of the empirical process over a class of functions (where g can be assumed to be bounded by $C \log n$) can be used to compute the rate of convergence of the estimator. This requires bounds for the entropy of the class of functions f of the form (4.13) together with a basic inequality that makes the connection between the mean of $\mathbb{M}_n(g - g_0)$ and

a distance between g and g_0. The entropy bounds are given in Section 4.3 below whereas the basic inequality is given in the following lemma. For each bounded function $g : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$, we define $\mathbb{M}g = \mathbb{P}f$ where f is given by (4.13) and $\mathbb{P}f = \int f d\mathbb{P}$, which means that $\mathbb{M}g$ is the expected value of $\mathbb{M}_n g$:

$$\mathbb{M}g = \int_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathbb{R}} \Big\{ yg(x) - \frac{g^2(x)}{2} \Big\} d\mathbb{P}(x, y). \tag{4.14}$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $g : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded funtion. Under the assumption A4 we have $\mathbb{M}(g-g_0) \leqslant -\underline{q}D^2(g, g_0)/2$ where*

$$D(g, g_0) = \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} (g(x) - g_0(x))^2 dx \right)^{1/2}. \tag{4.15}$$

If classical arguments for maximizers over a class of functions are used based on the previous basic inequality and Lemma 4.4 (which allows to restrict attention to functions g that are bounded by $C \log n$, for some large $C > 0$ that does not depend on n), the obtained rate of convergence would be inflated by a logarithmic factor:

Theorem 4.6. *Under assumptions A1-A4, we have $D(\widehat{g}_n, g_0) = O_p(n^{-1/3}(\log n)^{5/3})$.*

It may seem superfluous to add Theorem 4.6. However, the obtained unrefined rate of convergence will be used to get rid of the additional logarithmic factor. To explain how this works, set $v = Cn^{-1/3} \log n$ and $K = C \log n$ for some constant $C > 0$ to be chosen appropriately. Lemma 4.4 and Theorem 4.6 are used to show that with a probability that can be made arbitrarily large by choice of C, the LSE $\widehat{g}_n$ is bounded by K while the L_2-distance between $\widehat{g}_n$ and g_0 is smaller that v. Hence, with arbitrarily large probability, the LSE maximizes $\mathbb{M}_n g$ over the set $\mathcal{G}_{Kv}$ of all functions g of the form $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x)$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $|g(x)| \leqslant K$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and

$$D(g, g_0) \leqslant v. \tag{4.16}$$

Hence, although optimization cannot be restricted to a set of functions that are uniformly bounded in n, we can work with a class of of functions that are bounded in the L_2-norm. The merit of the latter is that under A2, a function $g \in \mathcal{G}_{Kv}$ can be shown to exceed $2K_0$ only on a subset of $\mathcal{X}$ with Lebesgue measure not larger than $(v/K_0)^2$. The fact that considered functions g are bounded by $2K_0$ except on such a small region will balance out the large values that g might have on the same region, and this will prove to be very advantageous in computing the final entropy of the original class of functions. To estimate this entropy, each function $g(.) = \Psi(\alpha^T .)$ will be decomposed as follows:

$$g = (g - \bar{g}) + \bar{g} \tag{4.17}$$

where $\bar{g}$ is the truncated version of g defined by

$$\bar{g}(x) = \begin{cases} g(x) & \text{if } |g(x)| \leqslant 2K_0 \\ 2K_0 & \text{if } g(x) > 2K_0 \\ -2K_0 & \text{if } g(x) < -2K_0. \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

The set of all possible $\bar{g}$ forms now a class of bounded functions on which standard arguments from empirical processes theory apply. On the other hand, the differences $g - \bar{g}$ form a set of functions whose supremum norm increases with n and which, by the discussion above, take the value zero except on regions of a very small size. Those two classes of functions will be treated with different arguments. Below are some entropy results required in the proof of Theorems 4.6 and 4.1. The complete proofs are given in Subsections 6.6 and 6.7 whereas the proofs of the lemmas are given in Subsections 6.3 to 6.5.

4.3. Entropy results

We begin with some notation. For any class of functions $\mathcal{F}$ equipped with a norm $\|\cdot\|$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, we denote by $H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|)$ the corresponding bracketing entropy:

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|) = \log N_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|)$$

where $N_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|) = N$ is the smallest number of pairs of functions $(f_1^U, f_1^L), \ldots, (f_N^U, f_N^L)$ such that all $\|f_j^L - f_j^U\| \leqslant \varepsilon$ and for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists a $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that $f_j^L \leqslant f \leqslant f_j^U$. Moreover, assuming that X has a bounded support $\mathcal{X}$, we set $R = \sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \|x\|$ where $\|\,.\,\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We then have

$$|\alpha^T x| \leqslant R \quad \textit{for all } x \in \mathcal{X} \tag{4.19}$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Hence, we will consider monotone functions Ψ defined on a sub-interval of $[-R, R]$; we will extend these functions to the entire interval $[-R, R]$ by taking the extension to be constant to the left and right of the end points of the support. In the rest of the paper, we will use the following notation

- $\|\cdot\|_{2,I}$ is the L_2 norm on I, where I can denote either an interval of $\mathbb{R}$ or a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, with respect to the corresponding Lebesgue measure,
- $\mathcal{M}_{IK}$ is the class of all nondecreasing functions on some interval I that are bounded in absolute value by K,
- $\mathcal{G}_{IK}$ is the class of functions $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x),\ x \in \mathcal{X}$ where $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}, \Psi \in \mathcal{M}_{IK}$,
- $\mathcal{F}_{IK}$ is the class of functions f of the form (4.13), $x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathbb{R}$, and $g \in \mathcal{G}_{IK}$,
- $\mathcal{G}_{IKv}$ is the class of functions $g \in \mathcal{G}_{IK}$ satisfying the condition (4.16),
- $\mathcal{F}_{IKv}$ is the class of functions f of the form (4.13), $x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathbb{R}$, and $g \in \mathcal{G}_{IKv}$,
- $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{IKv}$ is the class of functions $g - \bar{g}$, where $g \in \mathcal{G}_{IKv}$ and $\bar{g}$ is given in (4.18),
- $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{IKv}$ is the class of functions $f - \bar{f}$, where f takes the form (4.13) for some $g \in \mathcal{G}_{IKv}$ and $\bar{f}(x, y) = y\bar{g}(x) - \bar{g}^2(x)/2,\ x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathbb{R}$.

Our starting point is the two following results.

Lemma 4.7. *There exists a universal constant $A > 0$ such that*

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_{[a,b]K}, \|\,.\,\|_{2,[a,b]}) \leqslant \frac{A\sqrt{b-a}\,K}{\varepsilon}$$

for all $-\infty < a < b < \infty$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $K > 0$.

The bound is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.7.5 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), and hence its proof is omitted. The next result, which follows from Lemma 22 of Feige and Schechtman (2002), gives a bound on the minimal number of subsets with diameter at most ε, say, into which $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ can be divided. Here, the diameter of some given subset $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, is given by $\sup_{(x,y)\in\mathcal{A}^2} \|x - y\|$.

Lemma 4.8. *Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \pi/2)$, and let $N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{S}_{d-1})$ be the number of subsets of equal size with diameter at most ε into which $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ can be partitioned. Then, there exists a universal constant $A > 0$, such that $N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{S}_{d-1}) \leqslant (A/\varepsilon)^d$.*

In what follows, we assume that the assumptions A_1-A_4 are fulfiled. The next step is to use the results above to construct ε-brackets for the classes $\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}$, $\mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]K}$, $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$. We begin with the classes $\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]K}$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $K > \varepsilon$. Then, there exists $A_1 > 0$ depending only on d and R such that*

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}, \|\,.\,\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_1 K}{\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, if $K > 1$ then there exists $A_2 > 0$ depending only on d, R, a_0 and $\bar{q}$ such that

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]K}, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_2 K^2}{\varepsilon}$$

where $\|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}$ is the L_2-norm corresponding to $\mathbb{P}$: $\|f\|_{\mathbb{P}}^2 = \int_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathbb{R}} f^2(x,y)d\mathbb{P}(x,y)$.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $v > 0$. There exist constants $A_1 > 0$ and $A_2 > 0$ depending only on K_0, d and $\mathcal{X}$ such that*

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\,.\,\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_1 K v}{\varepsilon} + d\log\left(\frac{A_1 K^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$$

for all $K > \varepsilon$ such that $Kv > A_2\varepsilon$. Moreover, there exists $A_1 > 0$ depending only on K_0, d, $\mathbb{Q}$ and a_0 such that

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_1 K^2 v}{\varepsilon} + 2d\log\left(\frac{A_1 K^4}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$$

for all $K > 1 \vee \varepsilon$ such that $Kv > A_2\varepsilon$.

The next lemma will be needed to give entropy bounds in the Bernstein norm. We recall that the Bernstein norm of some function f with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ is defined by

$$\|f\|_{B,\mathbb{P}} = \Big(2\mathbb{P}(e^{|f|} - 1 - |f|)\Big)^{1/2}.$$

With $\tilde{C} > 0$ a constant appropriately chosen, Lemma 4.11 below derives form Lemma 4.9 and 4.10 upper bounds on the bracketing number of the classes

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv} := \Big\{(f - f_0)\tilde{C}^{-1}, f \in \mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]Kv}\Big\} \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}_{[-R,R]Kv} := \Big\{f\tilde{C}^{-1}, f \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}\Big\} \tag{4.21}$$

with respect to the Bernstein norm. This will enable us to use Lemma 3.4.3 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) which does not require the class of functions of interest to be bounded.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $v > 0$. Let M be the same constant from the moment condition (4.9) of Assumption A3. Let $\tilde{C} = 4MK^2$ such that $K \geqslant (2K_0) \vee 2$. Then, there exist constants $A_1 > 0$ and $A_2 > 0$ depending only d, R, a_0, M, $\bar{q}$ such that*

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\cdot\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_1}{\varepsilon}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{B,\mathbb{P}} \leqslant A_2 v$$

for all $\tilde{f} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$. Similarly, there exist constants $A_1 > 0$ and $A_2 > 0$ depending only d, R, a_0, M, $\bar{q}$ and K_0 such that

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \widetilde{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\cdot\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_1 v}{\varepsilon} + 2d\log\left(\frac{A_1}{\varepsilon^2}\right), \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{B,\mathbb{P}} \leqslant A_2 v$$

for all $\tilde{f} \in \widetilde{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$, provided that $Kv > A_2\varepsilon$ and $K > \varepsilon$.

Note that the condition $\varepsilon < 2$ guarantees that $K > \varepsilon$ since $K \geqslant 2$. Also, we point out that the constants A_1 and A_2 many not be the same ones as in Lemma 4.10 but we can always increase their respective values so that they are suitable for Lemma 4.11.

5. Convergence of the separated estimators

We now derive from Theorem 4.1 convergence of $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ to α_0 and $\widehat{\Psi}_n$ to Ψ_0. Moreover, we are interested in the rate of convergence of the two estimators. Convergence can happen only under uniqueness of the limit so first we prove identifiability of Ψ_0 and α_0 under appropriate conditions.

5.1. Identifiability of the separated parameters

Let (X, Y) be a pair of random variables, where X takes values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and Y is an integrable real valued random variable such that (1.1) holds for some $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ and $\Psi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$. Identifiability of the parameter (α_0, Ψ_0) means here that if we can find β in $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, and h in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X) = h(\beta^T X)$ *a.s.* then $\beta = \alpha_0$ and $h = \Psi_0$ on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0} = \mathcal{C}_\beta$, where for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ we set $\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \{\alpha^T x, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ with $\mathcal{X}$ being the support of X. Although identifiability can be derived from Lin and Kulasekera (2007) when assuming that Ψ_0 is non-constant and continuous, for completeness we state below identifiability under a slightly less restrictive assumption, namely left– (or right–) continuity instead of continuity. A proof can be found in Section 8.3 in the Supplement. In the sequel, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ the set of all non-decreasing functions on the interval $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume A1 and that (1.1) holds for some $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{S}_d$ and some $\Psi_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\alpha_0}$ that is not constant on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$, and either left- or right-continuous on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$ with no discontinuity point at the boundaries of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$. Then, (Ψ_0, α_0) is uniquely defined.*

5.2. Convergence of the separated estimators

We begin by establishing consistency of $(\widehat{\alpha}_n, \widehat{\Psi}_n)$ where as before 4, $\widehat{\Psi}_n$ denotes the left-continuous LSE of Ψ_0 extended to $\mathbb{R}$, see Section 8.4 in the Supplement for a proof.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume A1-A4. Assume moreover that Ψ_0 is non-constant and continuous on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$. We then have*

$$\|\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0\| = o_p(1) \tag{5.22}$$

with $\|\cdot\|$ the Euclidean norm and

$$\sup_{t \in I} |\widehat{\Psi}_n(t) - \Psi_0(t)| = o_p(1) \tag{5.23}$$

for all compact intervals $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $K_- < \Psi_0(t) < K_+$ for all $t \in I$. Here, K_+ and K_- denote the largest and smallest values of Ψ_0 on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$.

Next, we establish rates of convergence for $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_n$. To show that both $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_n$ inherit the $n^{1/3}$ rate of convergence from the joint convergence established for the full estimator $\widehat{g}_n(\,.\,) = \widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T \cdot)$, some additional assumptions are needed.

A5. There exists an interior point $z_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$ such that Ψ_0 is continuously differentiable in the neighborhood of z_0, with $\Psi_0'(z_0) > 0$.

A6. The density of X, q, is continuous on $\mathcal{X}$.

Let $\underline{c} = \inf \mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$ and $\overline{c} = \sup \mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$. Our main result here is the following. It is proved in Section 8.4 in the Supplement.

Corollary 5.3. *Assume A1-A6 and Ψ_0 is continuous on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$. Then, $\|\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0\| = O_p(n^{-1/3})$. If moreover, Ψ_0 has a derivative bounded from above on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$, then*

$$\left(\int_{\underline{c}+v_n}^{\overline{c}-v_n} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(t) - \Psi_0(t))^2 dt\right)^{1/2} = O_p(n^{-1/3}) \tag{5.24}$$

for all sequences v_n such that $n^{1/3}v_n \to \infty$ and $\underline{c} + v_n \leqslant \overline{c} - v_n$.

6. Proof of Theorem 4.1

We will extend any monotone function defined on a given interval either on the whole real line or a bounded interval that contains the support of all the monotone functions involved. This can be done by taking the extension to be constant to the left and right of the end points of the original support.

6.1. Proof of Lemma 4.4

We use the same notation as in Section 2. Because for all fixed α, $\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha$ satisfies (2.5), where $\widehat{d}_1^\alpha \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \widehat{d}_{m_\alpha}^\alpha$ are the left derivatives of the greatest convex minorant of the cumulative sum diagram defined by (2.4), we have

$$\min_{1\leqslant k\leqslant m_\alpha} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k n_i^\alpha Y_i^\alpha}{\sum_{i=1}^k n_i^\alpha} \leqslant \widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha(\alpha^T X_j) \leqslant \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant m_\alpha - 1} \frac{\sum_{i=m_\alpha-k}^{m_\alpha} n_i^\alpha Y_i^\alpha}{\sum_{i=m_\alpha-k}^{m_\alpha} n_i^\alpha}$$

for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Therefore, $\min_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} Y_i \leqslant \widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha(\alpha^T X_j) \leqslant \max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} Y_i$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$. The inequalities (4.12) follow since by definition, $\widehat{g}_n(x)$ takes the form $\widehat{\Psi}_n^\alpha(\alpha^T x)$ for all x, where α is replaced by the LSE $\widehat{\alpha}_n \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$.

Now we prove that under the assumptions A2 and A3,

$$\max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} |Y_i| = O_p(\log n). \tag{6.25}$$

For an integer $s \geqslant 2$, it follows from the convexity of the function $z \mapsto |z|^s$ on $\mathbb{R}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} E[|Y - g_0(x)|^s | X = x] &\leqslant 2^{s-1}\Big(E[|Y|^s|X = x] + |g_0(x)|^s\Big) \\ &\leqslant 2^{s-1}\Big(s! a_0 M^{s-2} + K_0^s\Big) \\ &\leqslant s! b_0 (M')^{s-2} \end{aligned}$$

with $b_0 = 2(a_0 + K_0^2)$ and $M' = 2(M \vee K_0)$. Now, using Lemma 2.2.11 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) with $n = 1$ and $\tilde{Y} = Y - g_0(x)$ and after integrating out with respect to $d\mathbb{Q}$, we obtain

$$P\Big(|\tilde{Y}| > t\Big) \leqslant 2\exp\left(\frac{-t^2}{2(2b_0 + M't)}\right)$$

for all $t > 0$. Hence, with $t = C\log n$ such that $K_0 < C\log n/2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} P\Big(\max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} |Y_i| > C\log n\Big) &\leqslant \sum_{i=1}^n P\Big(|\tilde{Y}_1| > C\log n/2\Big) \\ &\leqslant 2n\exp\left(\frac{-C^2\log n}{4\,(4b_0(\log n)^{-1} + M'C)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

which converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$ provided that C is sufficiently large so that $8M'C < C^2$. Lemma 4.4 follows by combining (4.12) and (6.25). □

6.2. Proof of Lemma 4.5

We have

$$\mathbb{M}(g - g_0) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ g_0(x)(g(x) - g_0(x)) - \frac{g(x)^2}{2} + \frac{g_0(x)^2}{2} \right\} d\mathbb{Q}(x),$$

using the fact that $E[Y|X = x] = g_0(x)$. Hence

$$\mathbb{M}(g - g_0) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (g(x) - g_0(x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \leqslant -\frac{q}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (g(x) - g_0(x))^2 dx$$

using assumption A4. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.5. □

6.3. Proof of Lemma 4.9

Let $\varepsilon_\alpha = \varepsilon^2 K^{-2} \in (0, 1)$. By Lemma 4.8, $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ can be covered by N neighborhoods with diameter at most ε_α where $N \leqslant (A\varepsilon_\alpha^{-1})^d$ with $A > 0$ a universal constant. Let $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N\}$ denote elements of each of these neighborhoods. Now, consider an arbitrary $g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}$. Then, $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x),\ x \in \mathcal{X}$, for some $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}_{[-R,R]K}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. We can find $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that $\|\alpha - \alpha_i\| \leqslant \varepsilon_\alpha$. Then, extending Ψ to $[-2R, 2R]$ and using the monotonicity of Ψ together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we can write for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ that

$$g(x) = \Psi(\alpha_i^T x + (\alpha - \alpha_i)^T x) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R)$$

and $g(x) \geqslant \Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R)$. Note that both $\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R$ and $\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R$ belong to $[-2R, 2R]$. Then, Lemma 4.7 implies that with $N' = \exp(2A\sqrt{R}K\varepsilon^{-1})$, at the cost of increasing A, we can find brackets $[\Psi_j^L, \Psi_j^U]$ covering the class of functions $\mathcal{M}_{[-2R,2R]K}$ such that

$$\int_{-2R}^{2R} (\Psi_j^U(t) - \Psi_j^L(t))^2 dt \leqslant \varepsilon^2.$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, N'$. Now returning to g, and using that $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}_{[-2R,2R]K}$, we can see that

$$\Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \leqslant g(x) \leqslant \Psi_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R)$$

for some $j = 1, \ldots, N'$ and all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. We will show that there exists $B > 0$ depending only on d, R such that the new bracket $[\Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R), \Psi_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R)],\ x \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfies

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\Psi_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - \Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \leqslant B\varepsilon. \tag{6.26}$$

It follows from the Minkowski inequality that the left-hand side in (6.26) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) - \Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\Psi_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - \Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - \Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

Using the fact that for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ there exists at least an index $j \in \{1,\dots,d\}$ such that $|\alpha_j| \geqslant 1/\sqrt{d}$, we can assume without loss of generality that the first component of α_i satisfies this property. Hence, using the change of variable $t_1 = \alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R$ and $t_j = x_j, j = 2,\dots,d$ and that fact that $t_1 \in [-2R, 2R], t_j \in [-R, R],\ j = 2,\dots,d$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) - \Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R)\Big)^2 dx &\leqslant \sqrt{d}(2R)^{d-1} \int_{-2R}^{2R} \Big(\Psi(t) - \Psi_j^L(t)\Big)^2 dt \\ &\leqslant \sqrt{d}(2R)^{d-1}\varepsilon^2\end{aligned}$$

and a similar bound is found for the square of the second integral in (6.27). Hence, the left-hand side in (6.26) is less than or equal to

$$2^{(d+1)/2} d^{1/4} R^{(d-1)/2}\varepsilon + \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - \Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R)\Big)^2 dx\right)^{1/2}.$$

Now using the change of variable $t_1 = \alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R$ and $t_j = x_j, j = 2,\dots,d$ and assuming again without loss of generality that the first component of α_i is greater or equal than $1/\sqrt{d}$ we can write

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - \Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R)\Big)^2 dx \leqslant d^{1/2}(2R)^{d-1} \int_{-2R}^{2R} \Big(\Psi(t) - \Psi(t - 2\varepsilon_\alpha R)\Big)^2 dt.$$

By monotonicity of Ψ (which can be extended to the whole real line) and the fact that it is bounded in absolute value by K, this is at most

$$\begin{aligned}&2Kd^{1/2}(2R)^{d-1} \int_{-2R}^{2R} \Big(\Psi(t) - \Psi(t - 2\varepsilon_\alpha R)\Big) dt \\ &\quad = 2Kd^{1/2}(2R)^{d-1} \left(\int_{2R-2\varepsilon_\alpha R}^{2R} \Psi(t)dt - \int_{-2R-2\varepsilon_\alpha R}^{-2R} \Psi(t)dt\right) \\ &\quad \leqslant 2^{d+2} d^{1/2} R^d \varepsilon^2,\end{aligned}$$

using that $\varepsilon_\alpha = \varepsilon^2/K^2$. Hence,

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - \Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R)\Big)^2 dx\right)^{1/2} \leqslant 2^{(d+2)/2} d^{1/4} R^{d/2}\varepsilon. \tag{6.28}$$

Combining the inequalities above, we get the claimed inequality in (6.26) with $B = 2^{(d+1)/2} d^{1/4} R^{(d-1)/2}(1+\sqrt{2R})$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}H_B(B\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}, \|\,.\,\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}) &\leqslant \log N + \log N' \\ &\leqslant d\log\left(\frac{AK^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right) + \frac{2A\sqrt{R}K}{\varepsilon} \\ &\leqslant 2\varepsilon^{-1}\Big(dA^{1/2} + A\sqrt{R}\Big)K\end{aligned}$$

since $\log x \leqslant 2\sqrt{x}$ for all $x > 0$. The first assertion of Lemma 4.9 follows.

To prove the second assertion, we need to build brackets for the class of functions $(x, y) \mapsto yg(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathbb{R}$, and then for the class of functions g^2, with $g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}$. In the following,

we denote the former class by $\mathcal{G}_1$ and the latter by $\mathcal{G}_2$ with which we begin. Note that $g^2(x) = s(x) = \Psi^2(\alpha^T x) = h(\alpha^T x)$ for some function h that is either monotone non-decreasing, monotone non-increasing or U-shaped depending on the sign of Ψ. Hence, the function h can be always decomposed into the difference of two monotone functions on $[-R, R]$ that are bounded by K^2. If $K^2 > \varepsilon$ (which holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $K > \varepsilon$ such that $K > 1$), we can use similar arguments as above to conclude that there exist a constant $B_0 > 0$ depending only on d and R such that

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_2, \|\,.\,\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{B_0 K^2}{\varepsilon}.$$

Using the fact that any element $s \in \mathcal{G}_2$ satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathcal{X}} s^2(x) d\mathbb{P}(x,y) \quad = \quad \int_{\mathcal{X}} s^2(x) d\mathbb{Q}(x) \leqslant \bar{q}\int_{\mathcal{X}} s^2(x)dx,$$

where $\bar{q}$ is the upper bound of the density of $\mathbb{Q}$ in (4.10), it follows that

$$H_B\Big(\sqrt{\bar{q}}\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_2, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{B_0 K^2}{\varepsilon}. \tag{6.29}$$

Now we turn to $\mathcal{G}_1$. With $N = N_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}, \|\,.\,\|_{2,\mathcal{X}})$, we will denote by $\{(g_i^L, g_i^U), i \in \{1,\dots,N\}\}$ a cover of ε-brackets for $\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}$. For all $i = 1,\dots,N$, define

$$k_i^U(x,y) = \begin{cases} y g_i^U(x) & \text{if } y \geqslant 0 \\ y g_i^L(x) & \text{if } y \leqslant 0 \end{cases}, \qquad k_i^L(x,y) = \begin{cases} y g_i^L(x) & \text{if } y \geqslant 0 \\ y g_i^U(x) & \text{if } y \leqslant 0 \end{cases}. \tag{6.30}$$

Now, take $g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}$ and let $i \in \{1,\dots,N\}$ such that $g_i^L \leqslant g \leqslant g_i^U$. Then, we have $k_i^L(x,y) \leqslant yg(x) \leqslant k_i^U(x,y)$ so that $\{(k_i^L, k_i^U),\ i \in \{1,\dots,N\}\}$ form a bracketing cover for $\mathcal{G}_1$. We will now compute its size. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{X}} \Big(k_i^U(x,y) - k_i^L(x,y)\Big)^2 d\mathbb{P}(x,y) \quad &= \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{X}} y^2 \times \Big(g_i^U(x) - g_i^L(x)\Big)^2 d\mathbb{P}(x,y) \\
&\leqslant \quad 2a_0 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(g_i^U(x) - g_i^L(x)\Big)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \\
&\leqslant \quad 2a_0\bar{q}\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(g_i^U(x) - g_i^L(x)\Big)^2 dx \leqslant 2a_0\bar{q}\,\varepsilon^2
\end{aligned}$$

where a_0 is taken from (4.9). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_B\Big(\sqrt{2a_0\bar{q}}\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_1, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}\Big) \quad &\leqslant \quad H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}, \|\,.\,\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}\Big) \\
&\leqslant \quad \frac{A_1 K}{\varepsilon},
\end{aligned} \tag{6.31}$$

using the first assertion of the lemma. But for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]K}, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}) \leqslant H_B(\varepsilon/2, \mathcal{G}_1, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}) + H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_2, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}) \tag{6.32}$$

and hence we obtain the second assertion of the lemma. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.9. □

6.4. Proof of Lemma 4.10

Let $g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ such that $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x)$. Here, the support of Ψ is the interval $\{\alpha^T x, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, the boundaries of which we denote by a and b. We shall show below that $|\Psi(t)| \leqslant 2K_0$ except on a region of small size. To do that, we shall use the condition (4.16) together with the triangle inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Psi(\alpha^T x)|>2K_0\}} dx &\leqslant \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Psi(\alpha^T x)-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)|>K_0\}} dx \\ &\leqslant \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{\Psi(\alpha^T x) - g_0(x)}{K_0}\right)^2 dx \leqslant v^2 K_0^{-2}.\end{aligned}$$

All components of α_j are smaller than or equal to one in absolute value, so with the change of variable $t_1 = \alpha^T x$, $t_2 = x_2, \ldots, t_d = x_d$, we have that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Psi(\alpha^T x)|>2K_0\}} dx \geqslant D_1 \int_a^b \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Psi(t)|>2K_0\}} dt$$

where $D_1 = \int_{\mathcal{X}_{d-1}} dx_2 \ldots dx_d > 0$ with $\mathcal{X}_{d-1} = \{(x_2, \ldots, x_d), x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Combining the two preceding displays, we conclude that

$$\int_a^b \mathbb{1}_{\{|\Psi(t)|>2K_0\}} dt \leqslant D_2 v^2.$$

where $D_2 = D_1^{-1} K_0^{-2}$. By monotonicity of Ψ, this means that $|\Psi(t)| \leqslant 2K_0$ for all t in the interval $[a + D_2 v^2, b - D_2 v^2]$. Now, note that $g(x) - \bar{g}(x)$ takes the form of $h(\alpha^T x)$ where h is a monotone function on $[a, b]$ that is bounded by K and such that

$$h(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |\Psi(t)| \leqslant 2K_0 \\ \Psi(t) + 2K_0 & \text{if } \Psi(t) < -2K_0 \\ \Psi(t) - 2K_0 & \text{if } \Psi(t) > 2K_0. \end{cases}$$

Hence, we can have $h(t) \neq 0$ only for $t \in [a, a + D_2 v^2] \cup [b - D_2 v^2, b]$. Consider $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N\}$ the grid providing a ε_α-cover for $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ with $\varepsilon_\alpha = \varepsilon^2/K^2$ and $N \leqslant A(\varepsilon_\alpha^{-1})^d$, see Lemma 4.8. Similar to the proof of Lemma 4.9, with α_i such that $\|\alpha - \alpha_i\| \leqslant \varepsilon_\alpha$, we then have

$$h(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \leqslant g(x) - \bar{g}(x) \leqslant h(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) \tag{6.33}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where h has been extended to the larger interval $[a_i, b_i]$ where

$$a_i = \inf\{\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R, x \in \mathcal{X}\} \quad \text{and} \quad b_i = \sup\{\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R, x \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Note that $|a - a_i| \leqslant 2\varepsilon_\alpha R$ and $|b - b_i| \leqslant 2\varepsilon_\alpha R$. From what precedes, with the extended version of h we can have $h(t) \neq 0$ only for $t \in \mathcal{I}_{i,1} \cup \mathcal{I}_{i,2}$ where

$$\mathcal{I}_{i,1} = \Big[a_i, a_i + D_2 v^2 + 2\varepsilon_\alpha R\Big] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_{i,2} = \Big[b_i - D_2 v^2 - 2\varepsilon_\alpha R, b_i\Big].$$

Hence, we only need to construct brackets for monotone functions that are bounded by K and defined on $\mathcal{I}_{i,1}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{i,2}$. This can be done by using Lemma 4.7 for $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}_{i,1}K}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}_{i,2}K}$. These classes admit N_i ε-brackets for the L_2 norm on the corresponding intervals where $N_i \leqslant \exp(A\sqrt{2D_2}Kv/\varepsilon)$ (at the cost of increasing the value of A), provided that $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfies $2\varepsilon_\alpha R <$

D_2v^2; i.e., $\varepsilon < (D_2/(2R))^{1/2} Kv$. Based on those brakets, we can build brackets $[h_j^L, h_j^U], j = 1, \ldots, N_i^2$ such that $h_j^L \leqslant h \leqslant h_j^U$ for some j on $[a_i, b_i]$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{a_i}^{b_i} |h_j^L(t) - h_j^U(t)|^2 dt &= \int_{a_i}^{a_i+2D_2v^2} |h_j^L(t) - h_j^U(t)|^2 dt + \int_{b_i-2D_2v^2}^{b_i} |h_j^L(t) - h_j^U(t)|^2 dt \\ &\leqslant 2\varepsilon^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6.34}$$

Note that we have omitted writing the dependence on i for the functions in the brackets. By (6.33) we have

$$h_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \leqslant g(x) - \bar{g}(x) \leqslant h_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and it remains to compute the size of the obtained brackets. By the Minkowski inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(h_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - h_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\qquad \leqslant \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(h_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - h_j^U(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\qquad\quad + \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(h_j^U(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) - h_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\qquad \leqslant \left(d^{1/2} D_1 \int_{a_i}^{b_i - 2\varepsilon_\alpha R} \left(h_j^U(t + 2\varepsilon_\alpha R) - h_j^U(t) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\qquad\quad + \left(d^{1/2} D_1 \int_{a_i}^{b_i} \left(h_j^U(t) - h_j^L(t) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

by using the change of variable $t_1 = \alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R$, $t_2 = x_2, \ldots, t_d = x_d$ and using that at least one component in α_i is larger than $d^{-1/2}$. Since h_j^L and h_j^U can be choosen monotone and bounded in absolute value by K we conclude from (6.34) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(h_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_\alpha R) - h_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_\alpha R) \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \leqslant \left(2Kd^{1/2} D_1 \int_{a_i}^{b_i - 2\varepsilon_\alpha R} \left(h_j^U(t + 2\varepsilon_\alpha R) - h_j^U(t) \right) dx \right)^{1/2} + \left(2d^{1/2} D_1 \right)^{1/2} \varepsilon \\ &\quad \leqslant \left(8\varepsilon_\alpha R K^2 d^{1/2} D_1 \right)^{1/2} + \left(2d^{1/2} D_1 \right)^{1/2} \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Since by definition, $\varepsilon_\alpha = \varepsilon^2/K^2$, this means that we have $C\varepsilon$-brackets where C depends on D_1, d and R only. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}H_B\left(C\varepsilon, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{X}} \right) &\leqslant 2\log(N_i) + \log(N) \\ &\leqslant \frac{2^{3/2} A D_2^{1/2} Kv}{\varepsilon} + d \log \frac{AK^2}{\varepsilon^2}\end{aligned}$$

and the first assertion of the lemma follows.

To prove the second assertion, recall that $(f - \bar{f})(x, y) = y(g(x) - \bar{g}(x)) - \frac{1}{2}(g^2(x) - \bar{g}^2(x))$. We need then to build brackets for the functions $(x, y) \mapsto y(g(x) - \bar{g}(x))$, and those for the

functions $x \mapsto g^2(x) - \bar{g}^2(x)$. The construction of the brackets goes along the same line as the construction of the brackets for the classes $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ in the proof of Lemma 4.9 above, where for the latter class, we use the fact that all functions in the class take the form $h(\alpha^T x)$ where h is either monotone or U-shaped, and vanishes when $|g(\alpha^T x)| \leqslant 2K_0$, which implies that the function vanishes except on at most two intervals of maximal length $D_2 v^2$.

Hence, we can find $A_1 > 0$ and $A_2 > 0$ depending on $d, K_0, \mathcal{X}, \mathbb{Q}$ and a_0 such that

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_1 K^2 v}{\varepsilon} + 2d \log \frac{A_1 K^4}{\varepsilon^2}$$

for $K > 1 \vee \varepsilon$ such that $K^2 v > A_2 \varepsilon$. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.10. □

6.5. *Proof of Lemma 4.11*

We start by noting that entropy bound on the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ is smaller than the entropy bound for the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]K}$ as a consequence of inclusion of the former class in the latter. We will now show that the upper bound with respect to the Bernstein norm for the class $\widetilde{F}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ is of the claimed order. Let $N_1 = N_B(\varepsilon/2, \mathcal{G}_1, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}})$ and $N_2 = N_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_2, \|\,.\,\|_{\mathbb{P}})$, where $\mathcal{G}_1$ is the class of functions $\{(x,y) \mapsto yg(x), g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ that of $\{x \mapsto g^2(x), g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}\}$. Consider the same brackets $[k_j^L, k_j^U],\ j = 1, \ldots, N_1$ covering $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $[s_i^L, s_i^U],\ i = 1, \ldots, N_2$ covering $\mathcal{G}_2$ as in the proof of Lemma 4.9: k_j^L and k_j^U satisfy (6.30) with appropriate g_j^L and g_j^U. Note that g_i^L and g_i^U can be always taken to be bounded by K, because otherwise we can take instead $g_i^L \vee (-K)$ and $g_i^U \wedge K$. The same thing holds for s_i^L and s_i^U which can be taken to be bounded by K^2. Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ and $\tilde{C} > 0$ a fixed constant to be chosen later. Then, there exists $(i,j) \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\} \times \{1, \ldots, N_2\}$ such that $f_{i,j}^L \leqslant f \leqslant f_{i,j}^U$ and

$$f_{i,j}^L(x,y) = \begin{cases} yg_j^L(x) - \frac{1}{2}s_i^U(x), & \text{if } y \geqslant 0 \\ yg_j^U(x) - \frac{1}{2}s_i^U(x), & \text{if } y < 0 \end{cases} ; f_{i,j}^U(x,y) = \begin{cases} yg_j^U(x) - \frac{1}{2}s_i^L(x), & \text{if } y \geqslant 0 \\ yg_j^L(x) - \frac{1}{2}s_i^L(x), & \text{if } y < 0. \end{cases}$$

Now note that for a given function h such that h^k is $\mathbb{P}$-integrable for all $k \geqslant 2$, we can write $\|h\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 = 2\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}(\int |h|^k d\mathbb{P})/k!$. Hence, by convexity of $x \mapsto x^k$ for $k \geqslant 2$, we have

$$\left\| \frac{f_{i,j}^U - f_{i,j}^L}{\tilde{C}} \right\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 \leqslant 2\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{2^{k-1}}{k!\tilde{C}^k} \int_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathbb{R}} \left\{ |y|^k \Big| g_j^U(x) - g_j^L(x) \Big|^k + \frac{1}{2^k} \Big| s_i^U(x) - s_i^L(x) \Big|^k \right\} d\mathbb{P}(x,y).$$

Integrating first with respect to y using the assumption A3 yields that the right-hand side is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &2\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{2^{k-1}}{k!\tilde{C}^k} \left\{ a_0 M^{k-2} k! \times (2K)^{k-2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |g_j^U - g_j^L|^2 d\mathbb{Q} + \frac{(2K^2)^{(k-2)}}{2^k} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |s_j^U - s_j^L|^2 d\mathbb{Q} \right\} \\ &\leqslant 2A \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{2^{k-1}}{k!\tilde{C}^k} \left\{ a_0 M^{k-2} k! \times (2K)^{k-2} \bar{q}\varepsilon^2 + \frac{(2K^2)^{(k-2)}}{2^k} \bar{q}\varepsilon^2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $A > 0$ depends only on d, R, a_0 and $\bar{q}$. Hence,

$$\left\| (f_{i,j}^U - f_{i,j}^L)\tilde{C}^{-1} \right\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 \leqslant \frac{2A\bar{q}}{\tilde{C}^2} \left(2a_0 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{4MK}{\tilde{C}} \right)^{k-2} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2K^2}{\tilde{C}} \right)^{k-2} \frac{1}{(k-2)!} \right) \varepsilon^2,$$

using the fact that $k! \geqslant 2(k-2)!$ for all $k \geqslant 2$. We conclude that

$$\left\|(f_{i,j}^U - f_{i,j}^L)\tilde{C}^{-1}\right\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 \leqslant \frac{2A\bar{q}}{\tilde{C}^2}(2a_0 \vee 1/4)\left(\frac{1}{1-4MK/\tilde{C}} + e^{2K^2/\tilde{C}}\right)\varepsilon^2.$$

since $K \geqslant 2$, the choice $\tilde{C} = 4MK^2$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|(f_{i,j}^U - f_{i,j}^L)\tilde{C}^{-1}\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 &\leqslant \frac{2A\bar{q}}{\tilde{C}^2}\Big(2a_0 \vee 1/4\Big)\left(\frac{K}{K-1} + e^{(2M)^{-1}}\right)\varepsilon^2 \\ &\leqslant B^2K^{-4}\varepsilon^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.35}$$

where B depends on $d, R, \bar{q}, M, a_0$ only. Using (6.29) and (6.31), this means that there exists A_2 depending on $\bar{q}, a_0, d, R$ only such that

$$\begin{aligned}H_B\Big(\frac{B\varepsilon}{K^2}, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\,.\,\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\Big) &\leqslant \log N_1 + \log N_2 \\ &\leqslant \frac{A_2K^2}{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

This in turn implies that

$$\begin{aligned}H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\,.\,\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\Big) &\leqslant \log N_1 + \log N_2 \\ &\leqslant \frac{A_2BK^2}{\varepsilon K^2} = \frac{A_1}{\varepsilon}\end{aligned}$$

as claimed in the statement of the lemma.

To show the second claim, we will use again the series expansion of the Bernstein norm. Similar as above, using that g_0 is bounded by $K_0 \leqslant K$, and that for arbitrary $\tilde{f} = (f - f_0)\tilde{C}^{-1} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$, the corresponding $g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ satisfies (4.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{f}\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 &\leqslant \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{2^k}{k!\tilde{C}^k}\left\{a_0M^{k-2}k!(2K)^{k-2}\int_{\mathcal{X}}(g-g_0)^2d\mathbb{Q} + \frac{(2K^2)^{(k-2)}}{2^k}\int_{\mathcal{X}}(g^2-g_0^2)^2d\mathbb{Q}\right\} \\ &\leqslant \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{2^k}{k!\tilde{C}^k}\left\{a_0M^{k-2}k!(2K)^{k-2}\int_{\mathcal{X}}(g-g_0)^2d\mathbb{Q} + \frac{2(2K^2)^{k-1}}{2^k}\int_{\mathcal{X}}(g-g_0)^2d\mathbb{Q}\right\} \\ &\leqslant \left(\frac{4a_0}{\tilde{C}^2}\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(\frac{4MK}{\tilde{C}}\right)^{k-2} + \frac{(4K)^2}{\tilde{C}^2}\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(\frac{4K^2}{\tilde{C}}\right)^{k-2}\frac{1}{k!}\right)\bar{q}v^2 \\ &\leqslant \left(\frac{a_0}{2M^2K^4} + \frac{1}{4M^2K^2}e^{1/M}\right)\bar{q}v^2, \end{aligned} \tag{6.37}$$

using that $K \geqslant 2$. The second claim follows.

Using the same arguments as above in combination with the entropy bound for $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ obtained in Lemma 4.10 and which remains the same if the class $\mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ is shifted by a fixed function (here f_0) we can show that

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \widetilde{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}_{[-R,R]v}\|\,.\,\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_1v}{\varepsilon} + 2d\log\left(\frac{A_1}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$$

at the cost of increasing the constant A_1. To show the second assertion for the elements of $\widetilde{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$, we can use again the same arguments as for the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$. Indeed, the condition

$K \geqslant 2K_0 \vee 2$ implies that $\max(|g|, |\bar{g}|) \leqslant K$ since $|\bar{g}| \leqslant 2K_0$. Moreover, with $\tilde{C} = 4MK^2$ we get for any element $\tilde{f} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 &\leqslant \left(\frac{a_0}{32M^2} + \frac{1}{4M^2}e^{1/(2M)}\right)\bar{q}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(g(x) - \bar{g}(x)\Big)^2 dx \\ &\leqslant 4\left(\frac{a_0}{32M^2} + \frac{1}{4M^2}e^{1/(2M)}\right)\bar{q}v^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.38}$$

where in the last line we used the fact that by convexity of $x \mapsto x^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(g(x) - \bar{g}(x)\Big)^2 dx &\leqslant 2\int_{\mathcal{X}}(g(x) - g_0(x))^2 dx + 2\int_{\mathcal{X}}(\bar{g}(x) - g_0(x))^2 dx, \\ &\leqslant 4\int_{\mathcal{X}}(g(x) - g_0(x))^2 dx, \end{aligned} \tag{6.39}$$

as $(\bar{g} - g_0)^2 \leqslant (g - g_0)^2$ by definition of $\bar{g}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.11. □

6.6. *Proof of Theorem 4.6*

In the sequel, we assume that $A1$-$A4$ hold. Below, we give a uniform bound for the centered process $\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M}$, with $\mathbb{M}_n$ and $\mathbb{M}$ defined by (4.11) and (4.14) respectively. In the sequel, the notation $\lesssim$ means "is bounded up to a constant", where the constant depends on d or K_0 and other fixed values used in the assumptions A1-A4, such as a_0, M, or R. Moreover, the capital E denotes outer expectation in cases when we consider expectation of a random variable which we have not proved to be measurable.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $K > 1$. Then, for all $v \in (0, 2K]$ we have*

$$\sqrt{n}E\left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}}\Big|(\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M})(g - g_0)\Big|\right] \lesssim \phi_n(v) \tag{6.40}$$

where $\phi_n(v) = v^{1/2}K^{5/2}(1 + K^{1/2}v^{-3/2}n^{-1/2})$.

Proof. Note that with $\tilde{K} = 2K + (2a_0)^{1/2} + 2K_0 \geqslant K$ we have

$$E\left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}}\Big|(\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M})(g - g_0)\Big|\right] \leqslant E\left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]\tilde{K}v}}\Big|(\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M})(g - g_0)\Big|\right],$$

so possibly replacing K by $\tilde{K}$, we assume without loss of generality that $K \geqslant (2a_0)^{1/2}$, $K \geqslant 2$ and $K \geqslant 2K_0$. Define for $\eta > 0$ and fixed $v \in (0, 2K]$

$$J(\eta) = \int_0^\eta \sqrt{1 + H_B\Big(\varepsilon, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}, \|\,.\,\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\Big)}d\varepsilon$$

where we recall that $\|\,.\,\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}$ is the Bernstein norm, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ is defined in (4.20) with $\tilde{C} = 4MK^2$. By Lemma 4.11, there exists a constant $A_2 > 0$ depending only on d,R, a_0, M and $\bar{q}$ such that $\|\tilde{f}\|_{B,\mathbb{P}} \leqslant A_2 v$ for all $\tilde{f} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$. It follows from Lemma 3.4.3 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) (using the notation of that book) that

$$E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}}] \lesssim J\big(A_2 v\big)\left(1 + \frac{J\big(A_2 v\big)}{A_2^2 v^2\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

where by Lemma 4.11 and the inequality $\sqrt{u+v} \leqslant \sqrt{u} + \sqrt{v}$ for $u, v \geqslant 0$ we have that

$$J(\eta) \leqslant \int_0^\eta \sqrt{1 + \frac{A_1}{\varepsilon}} d\varepsilon \leqslant \eta + 2A_1^{1/2}\eta^{1/2}$$

for all $\eta > 0$. Note that $v \in (0, 2K]$ implies that $v \leqslant v^{1/2}2^{1/2}K^{1/2}$, and hence

$$J\big(A_2 v\big) \leqslant \big(A_2 2^{1/2}K^{1/2} + 2A_1^{1/2}A_2^{1/2}\big)v^{1/2} \leqslant A_3 K^{1/2} v^{1/2}$$

using that $K \geqslant 1$, where $A_3 = A_2 2^{1/2} + 2A_1^{1/2}A_2^{1/2}$. Hence, by definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}E\bigg[\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}} \Big|(\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M})(g - g_0)\Big|\bigg] &= E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]Kv}}] \\ &= 4MK^2 E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}}] \lesssim \phi_n(v)\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Proposition 6.1. □

Now we are ready to give the proof of Theorem 4.6.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. In the sequel, we consider $K = C\log n$ for some $C > 0$ that does not depend on n, and $v \in (0, 2K]$. It follows from Proposition 6.1 that for all n sufficiently large, we have (6.40) where

$$\phi_n(v) = (\log n)^{5/2}\sqrt{v}\left(1 + (\log n)^{1/2}v^{-3/2}n^{-1/2}\right).$$

Since with D taken from (4.15), we have $D(g, g_0) \leqslant \|g\|_\infty + \|g_0\|_\infty \leqslant 2K$ for sufficiently large n and all $g \in \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}$, the above inequality holds for all $v > 0$. Furthermore, $\widehat{g}_n$ maximizes $\mathbb{M}_n g$ over the set of all functions g of the form $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x), x \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ and Ψ a non-decreasing function on $[-R, R]$, and it follows from Lemma 4.4 that with arbitrarily large probablity by choice of C, $\widehat{g}_n$ maximizes $\mathbb{M}_n g$ over the restricted set $\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K}$. Hence, we can use Lemma 4.5 and Theorem 3.2.5 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), with $\alpha = 1/2$ and $r_n \sim n^{1/3}(\log n)^{-5/3}$, to conclude that $D(\widehat{g}_n, g_0) = O_p^*(n^{-1/3}(\log n)^{5/3})$, which completes the proof of Theorem 4.6. □

6.7. *Proof of Theorem 4.1*

Still assuming that $A1$-$A4$ hold, we give a second uniform bound for $\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M}$. The bound is sharper than the one obtained in Proposition 6.1 for the case where all functions g in the considered class of functions satisfy (4.16) for some $v \leqslant (\log n)^2 n^{-1/3}$. As before, the notation $\lesssim$ means "is bounded up to a constant".

Proposition 6.2. *Let $K = C\log n$ for some fixed $C > 0$, and $v \in (0, (\log n)^2 n^{-1/3}]$. Then for n large enough we have that*

$$E\bigg[\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}} \Big|(\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M})(g - g_0)\Big|\bigg] \lesssim \frac{\phi_n(v)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

where $\phi_n(v) = Av^{1/2}\left(1 + v^{-3/2}n^{-1/2}\right)$.

Proof. Assume n large enough so that $K \geqslant (2K_0) \vee 2$ and use (4.17) to write

$$E\Big[\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}}\Big|(\mathbb{M}_n-\mathbb{M})(g-g_0)\Big|\Big] \leqslant E\Big[\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}}\Big|(\mathbb{M}_n-\mathbb{M})(g-\bar{g})\Big|\Big]+E\Big[\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}}\Big|(\mathbb{M}_n-\mathbb{M})(\bar{g}-g_0)\Big|\Big].$$

Hence,

$$\sqrt{n}E\Big[\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}}\Big|(\mathbb{M}_n-\mathbb{M})(g-g_0)\Big|\Big] \leqslant E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_1}]+E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_2}] \tag{6.41}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_1=\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ is the class of functions $\bar{f}-f_0$ such that $\bar{f}\in\mathcal{F}_{[-R,R](2K_0)v}$. To give a bound for the first term on the right-hand side, consider $v'=(\log n)^2n^{-1/6}$. It follows from Lemma 4.11 that for all $\varepsilon\in(0,A_2v]$, we have

$$H_B\Big(\varepsilon,\widetilde{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}}_{[-R,R]Kv'},\|\cdot\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\Big) \leqslant \frac{A_1v'}{\varepsilon}+2d\log\Big(\frac{A_1}{\varepsilon^2}\Big) \leqslant A_1(1+2d)\frac{v'}{\varepsilon} \tag{6.42}$$

provided that n is sufficiently large, where we used the fact that $\log(x)\leqslant 4x^{1/4}$ for all $x>0$ for the second inequality. Since the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1:=\widetilde{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ is included in $\widetilde{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}_{[-R,R]Kv'}$, its ε-bracketing entropy can be also bounded above by (6.42) for all $\varepsilon\in(0,A_2v]$. Using again the inequality $\sqrt{x+y}\leqslant\sqrt{x}+\sqrt{y}$ for all $x,y\geqslant 0$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(A_2v) &:= \int_0^{A_2v}\sqrt{1+H_B\Big(\varepsilon,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1,\|\cdot\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\Big)}d\varepsilon \\ &\leqslant A_2v+2\left(A_1(1+2d)v'\right)^{1/2}(A_2v)^{1/2}\leqslant A_3(v'v)^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

using that $v<v'$ and $K>1$, where $A_3>0$ is a constant depending on the same parameters as A_1 and A_2. Lemma 4.11 implies that $\|\tilde{f}\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\leqslant A_2v$ for all $\tilde{f}\in\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1$. Invoking Lemma 3.4.3 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) allows us to write that

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1}] &\lesssim J_1(A_2v)\left(1+\frac{J_1(A_2v)}{A_2^2v^2\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\leqslant A_3(v'v)^{1/2}\left(1+\frac{(v')^{1/2}}{v^{3/2}\sqrt{n}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

at the cost of increasing A_3. Now, using the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1$, we have that

$$E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_1}] = 4MK^2E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1}]\lesssim v^{1/2}\left(1+\frac{1}{v^{3/2}\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

This gives a bound for the first term on the right hand side of (6.41).

To deal with the second term, we apply Lemma 4.11 to the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_2=\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{[-R,R](2K_0)v}$ with $K=2K_0$. Here, $\tilde{C}=4MK_0^2$ is independent of n, and $J_2(A_2v)\leqslant A_3v^{1/2}$ for some $A_3>0$ that does not depend on n, where J_2 is defined in the same manner as J_1 with $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_1$ replaced by $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_2$. By Lemma 3.4.3 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we conclude that

$$E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_2}] = 16MK_0^2E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_2}]\lesssim v^{1/2}\left(1+\frac{1}{v^{3/2}\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Combining the calculations developed for both classes together with (6.41) gives the claimed form of the entropy bound. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Theorem 4.6 implies that with a probability that can be made arbitrarily large, the LSE $\widehat{g}_n$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]Kv}$ with $K = C \log n$ and $v = (\log n)^2 n^{-1/3}$ for some $C > 0$ that does not depend on n. The result follows now by applying again Theorem 3.2.5 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) with $\alpha = 1/2$ and $r_n \sim n^{1/3}$. □

Acknowledgements

Part of this work was done while the third author was at the University Paris Nanterre (laboratory Modal'x) as an invited visiting researcher. The third author thanks Paris Nanterre for the support.

References

Barlow, R. E., Bartholomew, D. J., Bremner, J. M. and Brunk, H. D. (1972). *Statistical inference under order restrictions. The theory and application of isotonic regression.* John Wiley & Sons, London-New York-Sydney. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

Chatterjee, S., Guntuboyina, A. and Sen, B. (2015). On risk bounds in isotonic and other shape restricted regression problems. *Ann. Statist.* **43** 1774–1800.

Chen, Y. and Samworth, R. (2016). Generalised additive and index models with shape constraints. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **78** 729–754.

Chiou, J.-M. and Müller, H.-G. (2004). Quasi-likelihood regression with multiple indices and smooth link and variance functions. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **31** 367–386.

Cosslett, S. R. (1983). Distribution-free maximum likelihood estimator of the binary choice model. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 765–782.

Cover, T. M. (1967). The number of linearly inducible orderings of points in d-space. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **15** 434–439.

Dobson, A. J. and Barnett, A. G. (2008). *An introduction to generalized linear models.* 3rd ed. Texts in Statistical Science Series, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Feige, U. and Schechtman, G. (2002). On the optimality of the random hyperplane rounding technique for MAX CUT. *Random Structures Algorithms* **20** 403–440. Probabilistic methods in combinatorial optimization.

Foster, J. C., Taylor, J. M. and Nan, B. (2013). Variable selection in monotone single-index models via the adaptive lasso. *Statistics in Medicine* **32** 3944–3954.

Groeneboom, P. and Hendrickx, K. (2016). Current status linear regression. *Available on arXiv: http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.00202* .

Groeneboom, P. and Pyke, R. (1983). Asymptotic normality of statistics based on the convex minorants of empirical distribution functions. *Ann. Probab.* **11** 328–345.

Han, A. K. (1987). Non-parametric analysis of a generalized regression model: the maximum rank correlation estimator. *Journal of Econometrics* **35** 303–316.

Han, Q. and Wellner, J. A. (2016). Multivariate convex regression: global risk bounds and adaptation. *Available on arXiv: http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.06844* .

Härdle, W., Hall, P. and Ichimura, H. (1993). Optimal smoothing in single-index models. *The Annals of Statistics* **21** 157–178.

Hristache, M., Juditsky, A. and Spokoiny, V. (2001). Direct estimation of the index coefficient in a single-index model. *Annals of Statistics* 595–623.

Kakade, S. M., Kanade, V., Shamir, O. and Kalai, A. (2011). Efficient learning of generalized linear and single index models with isotonic regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.*

Lin, W. and Kulasekera, K. (2007). Identifiability of single-index models and additive-index models. *Biometrika* **94** 496–501.

Murphy, S., Van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. (1999). Current status regression. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* **8** 407–425.

van de Geer, S. (1993). Hellinger-consistency of certain nonparametric maximum likelihood estimators. *Ann. Statist.* **21** 14–44.

van de Geer, S. A. (2000). *Empirical Processes in M-estimation*, vol. 6. Cambridge University Press.

van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*, vol. 3 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer-Verlag, New York. With applications to statistics.

Supplement to "Least squares estimation in the monotone single index model"

7. Appendix A: All proofs for Adaptive Rates of Convergence

We use the same notation as in Section 4.3, with the following additions. We also assume throughout A1-A4.

- Let $\mathcal{M}_{IK}$ denote the class of monotone increasing functions $\Psi : I \mapsto [-K, K]$, as before. Furthermore, suppose that $\Psi_0 : I \mapsto [-K, K]$ denote any fixed increasing function, and let $\mathcal{M}_{IK}^{\Psi_0}(\delta)$ denote the class of monotone increasing functions $\Psi : I \mapsto [-K, K]$, where I is a connected interval and such that $\|\Psi - \Psi_0\|_{2,I} \leqslant \delta$.
- The notation $\lesssim$ means "is bounded up to a constant", as in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, page 289). Here, the constant depends on d or K_0 and other fixed values used in the assumptions A1-A4, such as a_0, M, or R.

7.1. Entropy bounds

When the class of monotone functions is known to be close to a constant, we obtain the following closer bound. This follows from van de Geer (1993, Lemma 4.7).

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose that $\Psi_0 = 0$. Then, there exists a constant $A > 0$ such that*

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_{IK}^{\Psi_0}(\delta), \|\cdot\|_{2,I}) \quad \leqslant \quad A \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{2KL^{1/2}}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$, where L denotes the length of the interval I.

Corollary 7.2. *There exists a universal constant $A > 0$ such that*

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_{IK}^{\Psi_0}(\delta), \|\cdot\|_{2,I}) \quad \leqslant \quad A\kappa \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{2K(\kappa L)^{1/2}}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

for all $\delta \geqslant \varepsilon > 0$, where L denotes the length of the interval I and $\Psi_0 : I \mapsto [-K, K]$ is an increasing piecewise constant function. Here, κ denotes the number of unique values taken by Ψ_0.

Lemma 7.3. *Assume that Ψ_0 in (1.1) is an increasing piecewise constant function with κ unique values. Then, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leqslant \delta < K^{-1}$ and $K \geqslant 3$ we have*

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K\delta}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}) \quad \lesssim \quad \kappa \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

for $\delta \leqslant 1/(4C_{R,d}\sqrt{R} + 1)$ where $\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K\delta}$ is defined as in Section 4.3.

The above results quantify the effect of the finite-dimensional index parameter on the entropy of the class $\mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K\delta}$. Namely, its size is negligible when compared to the size of the monotone class of functions. This is, of course, an expected result, as in a semi-parametric model the non-parametric portion should "dominate" the rate of convergence.

Finally, we obtain additional results for an appropriate set of functions using the Bernstein norm. We choose to work with the Bernstein norm $\|\cdot\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}$ because it provides slightly tighter results in terms of the upper bound K, allowing us to use van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Lemma 3.4.3) over van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Lemma 3.4.2).

Lemma 7.4. *There exists a constant c depending on $a_0, M, \bar{q}$ such that, for $K > 1/6$,*

$$H_B\left(\varepsilon, \frac{1}{12MK^2} \times \{\mathcal{F}_{[-R,R]K\delta} - f_0\}, \|\cdot\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\right) \leqslant H_B\left(\frac{K\varepsilon}{c}, \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K(K\delta/c)}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}\right).$$

and

$$\left\|\frac{1}{12MK^2}(f - f_0)\right\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 \leqslant c^2K^{-2}\int_{\mathcal{X}}(g(x) - g_0(x))^2dx. \tag{7.43}$$

Proof of Lemma 7.4. Recall that $f = yg - g^2/2$. Therefore, $f - f_0 = y(g - g_0) - (g^2 - g_0^2)/2$. Consider some ε_1, δ_1 to be chosen later. Suppose that $g \in \mathcal{G}_{IK\delta_1}$ where $I = [-K, K]$. Then, from the definition of the Bernstein norm, we have for $C = 12MK^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|(f - f_0)C^{-1}\right\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 \\
&\leqslant \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{2^k}{k!C^k}\int_{\mathcal{X}\times\mathbb{R}}\left\{|y|^k\left|g(x) - g_0(x)\right|^k + \frac{1}{2^k}\left|g^2(x) - g_0^2(x)\right|^k\right\}d\mathbb{P}(x,y) \\
&\leqslant \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{2^k}{k!C^k}\left\{a_0M^{k-2}k! \times (2K)^{k-2}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(g(x) - g_0(x)\Big)^2d\mathbb{Q}(x)\right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. + \frac{(2K^2)^{(k-2)}}{2^k}\int_{\mathcal{X}}(g(x) + g_0(x))^2(g(x) - g_0(x))^2dx\right\} \\
&\leqslant \overline{q}\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{2^k}{k!C^k}\left\{a_0M^{k-2}k! \times (2K)^{k-2} + \frac{(2K^2)^{(k-2)} \times (2K)^2}{2^k}\right\}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(g(x) - g_0(x)\Big)^2dx \\
&\leqslant \overline{q}\frac{1}{(12MK^2)^2}\left\{4a_0\left(\frac{1}{1 - 1/6K}\right) + 4K^2e^{1/(6M)}\right\}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(g(x) - g_0(x)\Big)^2dx \\
&\leqslant c_1^2K^{-2}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(g(x) - g_0(x)\Big)^2dx \leqslant c_1^2K^{-2}\delta_1^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This also proves (7.43).

Next, consider brackets for the class $g \in \mathcal{G}_{IK\delta_1}$, $\{g_i^L, g_i^U\}$, such that $\|g_i^L - g_i^U\|_{2,\mathcal{X}} \leqslant \varepsilon_1$, with $i = 1, \ldots, N_1$, where $\log N_1 = H_B\Big(\varepsilon_1, g \in \mathcal{G}_{IK\delta_1}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}\Big)$. We now use this class of functions to form further brackets. We make use of the fact that $2K \geqslant g_i^L + K \geqslant 0$ throughout. First, note that if $g_i^L \leqslant g \leqslant g_i^U$ then

$$(g_i^L + K)^2 - 2Kg_i^U - K^2 \leqslant g^2 \leqslant (g_i^U + K)^2 - 2Kg_i^L - K^2.$$

Therefore, defining

$$f_i^L(x,y) = \begin{cases} yg_i^L(x) - \frac{1}{2}\left\{(g_i^U)^2 + 2K(g_i^U - g_i^L)\right\}(x), & \text{if } y \geqslant 0 \\ yg_i^U(x) - \frac{1}{2}\left\{(g_i^U)^2 + 2K(g_i^U - g_i^L)\right\}(x), & \text{if } y < 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$f_i^U(x,y) = \begin{cases} yg_i^U(x) - \frac{1}{2}\left\{(g_i^L)^2 + 2K(g_i^L - g_i^U)\right\}(x), & \text{if } y \geqslant 0 \\ yg_i^L(x) - \frac{1}{2}\left\{(g_i^L)^2 + 2K(g_i^L - g_i^U)\right\}(x), & \text{if } y < 0 \end{cases}$$

we have that $f_i^L \leqslant f \leqslant f_i^U$ and $f_i^L - f_0 \leqslant f - f_0 \leqslant f_i^U - f_0$ (noting that $((f_i^U - f_0) - (f_i^L - f_0)) = (f_i^U - f_i^L)$). It remains to check the size of the brackets.

$$f_i^U - f_i^L = \begin{cases} \left\{y + 2K + \frac{1}{2}(g_i^U + g_i^L)\right\}(g_i^U - g_i^L), & \text{if } y \geqslant 0, \\ \left\{y - 2K + \frac{1}{2}(g_i^U + g_i^L)\right\}(g_i^L - g_i^U), & \text{if } y < 0. \end{cases}$$

Recall that $\|h\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 = 2\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(\int |h|^k d\mathbb{P}\right)/k!$. Hence, choosing $C = 12MK^2$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(f_i^U - f_i^L)/C\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}^2 \\ &\quad\leqslant \quad \overline{q}\left\{a_0\frac{4}{C^2}\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(\frac{2MK}{C}\right)^{k-2} + \frac{36K^2}{C^2}\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(\frac{12K^2}{C}\right)^{k-2}\frac{1}{k!}\right\}\int |g_i^U - g_i^L|^2 dx \\ &\quad= \quad \overline{q}\left\{a_0\frac{4}{C^2}\frac{1}{1-1/6K^2} + \frac{36K^2}{C^2}e^{1/M}\right\}\int |g^U - g^L|^2 dx \\ &\quad\overset{K\geqslant 1}{\leqslant} \quad \overline{q}\left\{a_0\frac{4}{144M^2}\frac{1}{1-1/6} + \frac{36}{144M^2}e^{1/M}\right\}K^{-2}\varepsilon_1^2 \quad\leqslant\quad c_2^2K^{-2}\varepsilon_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, take $c^2 = \max\{c_1^2, c_2^2\}$. We therefore choose $\varepsilon_1^2 = K^2\varepsilon^2/c^2$ and $\delta_1^2 = K^2\delta^2/c^2$. □

7.2. *Obtaining the rate result*

As in the proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.6, we make use throughout of the basic inequality given in Lemma 4.5. This is the inequality which allows us to make use of the empirical process results of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996).

Theorem 7.5. *Under assumptions A1-A4 and assuming that Ψ_0 an increasing piecewise constant function and κ denotes the number of unique values taken by Ψ_0, we have*

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x)\right)^2 dx\right)^{1/2} = O_p\left(\left(\frac{n}{\kappa}\right)^{-1/2}(\log n)^{3/2}\right).$$

The key ingredient in the proof is the bound on the class of functions that $\widehat{g}_n - g_0$ are known to lie in. It is obtained from empirical process theory (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Lemma 3.4.3, page 324), using Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4 above.

Proposition 7.6.

$$E\left(\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}_{IK\delta}} |(\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M})(g - g_0)|\right) \quad\lesssim\quad \frac{\phi_n(\delta)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

where

$$\phi_n(\delta) \quad=\quad K\delta\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}\left(1 + \frac{K\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}}{\delta\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

assuming that $\delta \leqslant \min\{c^2e^{-1}, 1\}K$.

7.2.1. Proofs

Proof of Proposition 7.6. The result follows from an application of Lemma 3.4.3 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, page 324), along with our obtained entropy bounds. We write $\mathbb{M}_n(g) = \mathbb{P}_n(f)$, where $f(x,y) = yg(x) - g^2(x)/2$. Then, we have

$$E\left(\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}_{IK\delta}} |(\mathbb{M}_n - \mathbb{M})(g-g_0)|\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} E[\|\mathbb{G}_n(f-f_0)\|_{\mathcal{F}_{IK\delta}}]$$

By (7.43) of Lemma 7.4 we have that if $||g-g_0||_{2,\mathcal{X}} < \delta$ then $\|(f-f_0)/(12MK^2)\|_{B,\mathbb{P}} < cK^{-1}\delta$. Applying Lemma 3.4.3 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996)

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|\mathbb{G}_n(f-f_0)\|_{\mathcal{F}_{IK\delta}}] &= 12MK^2\, E[\|\mathbb{G}_n\left(\frac{f-f_0}{12MK^2}\right)\|_{\mathcal{F}_{IK\delta}}] \\ &\lesssim 12MK^2 J(\delta/cK)\left(1+\frac{J(\delta/cK)}{(\delta/cK)^2\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\lesssim K^2 J(\delta/cK)\left(1+K^2\frac{J(\delta/cK)}{\delta^2\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{7.44}$$

where

$$J(\delta) = \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1+H_B\left(\varepsilon, \frac{1}{12MK^2}(\mathcal{F}_{IK\delta}-f_0), \|\cdot\|_{B,\mathbb{P}}\right)}d\varepsilon.$$

Applying the first part of Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.3, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} J(\delta) &\lesssim \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1+H_B\left(\frac{K\varepsilon}{c}, \mathcal{G}_{IK(K\delta/c)}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}\right)}d\varepsilon \\ &\lesssim \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1+\kappa\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{cK\sqrt{\kappa}}{K\varepsilon}\right)}d\varepsilon \\ &\lesssim \delta + \sqrt{\kappa\delta}\int_0^\delta \sqrt{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{c\sqrt{\kappa}}{\varepsilon}\right)}d\varepsilon \\ &\lesssim \delta + \sqrt{\kappa\delta}(c^2\kappa)^{1/4}\int_0^{\delta/\sqrt{c^2\kappa}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)}d\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Next, it follows from Lemma 7.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} J(\delta) &\lesssim \delta + \sqrt{\kappa\delta}(c^2\kappa)^{1/4}\sqrt{\frac{\delta}{\sqrt{c^2\kappa}}\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{c^2\kappa}}{\delta}\right)} \\ &\lesssim \delta + \delta\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{c^2\kappa}}{\delta}\right)} \\ &\overset{\delta\leqslant ce^{-1},\,\kappa\geqslant 1}{\lesssim} \delta\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{c^2\kappa}}{\delta}\right)} \\ &\overset{\delta\leqslant c^{-1},\,\kappa\geqslant 1}{\lesssim} \delta\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the conditions put together imply that $\delta \leqslant \min\{ce^{-1}, c^{-1}\}$.

This, using (7.44), in turn implies that

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|\mathbb{G}_n(f-f_0)\|_{\mathcal{F}_{IK\delta}}] &\lesssim K^2 J(\delta/cK)\left(1+K^2\frac{J(\delta/cK)}{\delta^2\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\lesssim K\delta\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}\left(1+\frac{K\delta\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}}{\delta^2\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\leqslant K\delta\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}\left(1+\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}}{\delta\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

as required, for $\delta/cK \leqslant \min\{ce^{-1}, c^{-1}\}$. □

Proof of Theorem 7.5. Fix $\eta > 0$. By Lemma 4.4, we know that $\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} |\widehat{g}_n(x)| = O_p(\log n)$. Therefore, we can find a $C_1 = C_{1,\eta}$ such that $P(\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} |\widehat{g}_n(x)| > C_1 \log n) < \eta/2$. This allows us to consider the previous entropy bounds with $K = C_1 \log n$. Then, for any constant C_2

$$\begin{aligned} &P(r_n\|\widehat{g}_n - g_0\|_{2,\mathcal{X}} > C_2) \\ &\quad\leqslant P\left(r_n\|\widehat{g}_n - g_0\| > C_2, \widehat{g}_n \in \mathcal{G}_{I(C_1\log n)}\right) + P\left(\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} |\widehat{g}_n(x)| > C_1\log n\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall the results of Proposition 7.6. By van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Theorem 3.2.5, page 289), if for some $\alpha < 2$, $\phi_n(\delta)/\delta^\alpha$ is decreasing in δ, and we can find an r_n such that $r_n^2\phi_n(1/r_n) \lesssim \sqrt{n}$, then there exists a $C_2 = C_{2,\eta}$ such that $P(r_n\|\widehat{g}_n - g_0\| > C_2, \widehat{g}_n \in \mathcal{G}^{g_0}_{I(C_1\log n)}) < \eta/2$, proving the result. We now check these conditions. First, $\phi_n(\delta)/\delta^{3/2}$ is decreasing in δ. We also have,

$$\phi_n(\delta) = K\delta\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}\left(1+\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right)}}{\delta\sqrt{n}}\right),$$

with $K = C_1\log n$. Choosing $r_n = (n/\kappa)^{1/2}(\log n)^{-3/2}$, it follows that $r_n^2\phi_n(1/r_n) \lesssim \sqrt{n}$, as required. Note also that $r_n^{-1} \leqslant \min\{c^2e^{-1}, 1\}(C_2\log n)$ for large enough n. □

7.3. *Proofs of various entropy bounds*

In this Section we provide proofs of the required entropy bounds. We begin, however, with two small technical lemmas which will be used throughout.

Lemma 7.7. *1. For $0 < \varepsilon \leqslant \eta \leqslant e^{-1}$ and for $K \geqslant 1$, we have*

$$\log\left(\frac{K}{\varepsilon}\right) \lesssim K\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right).$$

2. For $0 < \varepsilon \leqslant \eta \leqslant 1/K$ and with $K, \kappa \geqslant 1$ we have

$$\log\left(\frac{K}{\varepsilon}\right) \lesssim \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right) \leqslant \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{\eta}\right) \leqslant \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\eta}\right)$$

Lemma 7.8. *Suppose that $\delta \leqslant e^{-1}$. Then*

$$\int_0^\delta \sqrt{\frac{1}{x}\log\frac{1}{x}}dx \quad \lesssim \quad \sqrt{\delta \log\frac{1}{\delta}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 7.7. For the first part of the lemma, consider the function $h(x) = x^{-1}\log x$. Since $h'(x) = (1-\log x)/x^2$ we know that h is a decreasing function on $[e,\infty)$, and since $\varepsilon \leqslant \eta$, we have that

$$1 \quad \leqslant \quad \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \quad \leqslant \quad \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\log\left(\frac{K}{\varepsilon}\right) &= \log K + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\\ &\leqslant K + \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right)\\ &\leqslant 2K\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon}\log\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right).\end{aligned}$$

For the second part, we proceed similarly, but first note that $\log K \leqslant \log(1/\varepsilon)$ under the condition that $\varepsilon \leqslant \eta \leqslant 1/K$. □

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Recall that $\mathcal{M}^{\Psi_0}_{[0,1](0.5)}(\delta)$ is the space of increasing functions $\{h : [0,1] \mapsto [-0.5, 0.5], \|h\|_{2,[0,1]} < \delta\}$. In van de Geer (1993, Lemma 4.7), it is shown that

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}^{\Psi_0}_{[0,1](0.5)}(\delta), \|\cdot\|_{2,[0,1]}) \quad \leqslant \quad A \quad \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

for some constant A.

Now, write $I = [a,b]$ and consider any $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}^{\Psi_0}_{IK}(\delta)$. Then, $h(u) = \Psi(a + (b-a)\times u)/2K$ is also increasing and satisfies $h : [0,1] \mapsto [-0.5, 0.5]$. Let $\{h_i^L, h_i^U\}$ denote lower and upper ε_1-brackets for the space $\mathcal{M}^{\Psi_0}_{[0,1](0.5)}(\delta_1)$, where $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $\delta_1 > 0$ will be chosen later. Define $\Psi_i^L(x) = 2Kh_i^L((x-a)/(b-a))$, and similarly for Ψ_i^U. Then for each $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}^{\Psi_0}_{IK}(\delta)$, there exists an i such that $\Psi_i^L \leqslant \Psi \leqslant \Psi_i^U$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_I \left(\Psi_i^U(x) - \Psi_i^L(x)\right)^2 dx &= 4K^2\int_I \left(h_i^U((x-a)/(b-a)) - h_i^L((x-a)/(b-a))\right)^2 dx\\ &= 4K^2|I|\int_0^1 \left(h_i^U(u) - h_i^L(u)\right)^2 du \quad \leqslant \quad 4K^2|I|\varepsilon_1^2.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for $\Psi_0 = 0$, we have

$$\int_a^b \left(\Psi(x) - \Psi_0(x)\right)^2 dx \quad = \quad 4K^2|I|\int_0^1 h^2(u)du \quad \leqslant \quad 4K^2|I|\delta_1^2.$$

Therefore, choosing $\varepsilon_1^2 = \varepsilon^2/4K^2|I|$ and $\delta_1^2 = \delta^2/4K^2|I|$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}^{\Psi_0}_{[a,b]K}(\delta), \|\cdot\|_{2,[a,b]}) &\leqslant H_B\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2K|I|^{1/2}}, \mathcal{M}^{\Psi_0}_{[0,1](0.5)}\left(\frac{\delta}{2K|I|^{1/2}}\right), \|\cdot\|_{2,[0,1]}\right)\\ &\leqslant A \quad \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{2K|I|^{1/2}}{\varepsilon}\right).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Proof of Corollary 7.2. Write $\Psi_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} c_i \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I}_i}$, where $\mathcal{I}_i$ are disjoint intervals with union equal to I, and $c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_\kappa$. For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{IK}^{\Psi_0}(\delta)$, write $f = f_1 + \ldots + f_\kappa$, where $f_i(x) = f(x)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I}_i}(x)$. Now, write $\bar{f}_i = f_i - c_i \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I}_i}$. Then, $f - \Psi_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \bar{f}_i$ and $\bar{f}_i$ is bounded by $2K$. By Minkowski's inequality, we have that

$$\left\{ \int (f(s) - \Psi_0(s))^2 ds \right\}^{1/2} \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{I}_i} \bar{f}_i^2(s) ds \right\}^{1/2}. \tag{7.45}$$

Next, let $f_{j_i}^L, f_{j_i}^U$ for $j_i = 1, \ldots, N_i$ denote an ε_i-bracket of the class $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}_i(2K)}^{\Psi_0=0}(\delta_i)$ where $\varepsilon_i > 0$ and $\delta_i > 0$ will be chosen later. Then, for any $\bar{f}_i \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}_i(2K)}^{\Psi_0=0}(\delta_i)$ there exists a bracket such that $f_{j_i}^L \leqslant \bar{f}_i \leqslant f_{j_i}^U$, for each i. It therefore follows that $\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} f_{j_i}^L \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \bar{f}_i \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} f_{j_i}^U$, so brackets for the class of interest can be formed by combining the brackets $\{f_{j_i}^L, f_{j_i}^U\}_{j_i=1,\ldots,N_i, i=1,\ldots,\kappa}$. Furthermore, the number of brackets required is at most $\prod_{i=1}^{\kappa} N_i$. Note that, for example, $\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} f_{j_i}^L$ is not necessarily an increasing function, however, brackets of $\mathcal{M}_{IK}^{\Psi_0}(\delta)$ are not required to be in the space $\mathcal{M}_{IK}^{\Psi_0}(\delta)$ (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Definition 2.1.6, page 83). Let f^U, f^L denote one such bracket, where we suppress its dependence on $\{j_i\}_{i=1}^{\kappa}$. By Minkowski's inequality again, we have

$$\left\{ \int (f^U(s) - f^L(s))^2 ds \right\}^{1/2} = \left\{ \int_I \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} (f_{j_i}^U - f_{j_i}^L)(s) \right)^2 ds \right\}^{1/2} \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \varepsilon_i.$$

Let L_i denote the length of the interval $\mathcal{I}_i$. It therefore follows from the above along with (7.45) that

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_{IK}^{\Psi_0}(\delta), \|\cdot\|_{2,I}) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} H_B\left(\varepsilon_i, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}_i(2K)}^{\Psi_0=0}(\delta_i), \|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{I}_i}\right),$$

provided that we choose $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon/\kappa$ and $\delta_i = \delta/\kappa$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon$, $\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \delta_i = \delta$, and $\delta_i/\varepsilon_i = \delta/\varepsilon$. Applying Lemma 7.1 several times, we obtain that there exists an A such that

$$\begin{aligned} H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_{IK}^{\Psi_0}(\delta), \|\cdot\|_{2,I}) &\leqslant A \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \left(\frac{\delta_i}{\varepsilon_i}\right) \log\left(\frac{4KL_i^{1/2}}{\varepsilon_i}\right) \\ &= A\left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \log\left(\frac{4KL_i^{1/2}\kappa}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\leqslant A\left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \kappa \log\left(\frac{4K\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} L_i^{1/2}}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\leqslant A\left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right) \kappa \log\left(\frac{4K\sqrt{\kappa L}}{\varepsilon}\right), \end{aligned}$$

using Jensen's inequality for the two last inequalities. This proves the result. □

Proof of Lemma 7.3. Recall (4.19) and let $I = [-R, R]$. Let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0,1)$ and $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0,1)$ with $\varepsilon_1 \leqslant \delta_1$ and $\varepsilon_2 \leqslant \delta_2$. Our goal here is to cover $\mathcal{G}_{IK\delta}$ with ε-envelopes created from ε_1-envelopes of the class of increasing functions $\mathcal{M}_{(2I)K}^{\Psi_0}(\delta_1)$ and ε_2-neighbourhoods covering of $\{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1} : \|\alpha - \alpha_0\| \leqslant \delta_2\} = \mathcal{S}_{d-1}(\delta_2) \subset \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. The sizes $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta_1, \delta_2$ will be chosen appropriately later on.

To this end, let $N = N(\varepsilon_2, \delta_2)$ denote the number of neighbourhoods with diameter at most ε_2 required to cover $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}(\delta_2)$. Let $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N\}$ denote elements of each of these neighbourhoods. For any $g \in \mathcal{G}_{IK\delta}$, with $g(x) = \Psi(\alpha^T x)$ for some monotone Ψ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}(\delta_2)$, we can find an $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that $\|\alpha - \alpha_i\| \leqslant \varepsilon_2$. Then, using the monotonicity of Ψ together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we can write

$$\Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) \quleqslant\quad g(x) \quad=\quad \Psi(\alpha_i^T x + (\alpha - \alpha_i)^T x) \quad\leqslant\quad \Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_2 R)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Note that both $\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R$ and $\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_2 R$ belong to $2I$ for $\varepsilon_2 \leqslant 1$. Next, let $[\Psi_j^L, \Psi_j^U]$ denote the ε_1-brackets of the increasing functions $\Psi : 2I \mapsto [-K, K]$, choosing the interval where the functions are defined as $2I = 2[-R, R]$. These functions are defined on a larger interval then needed, and to take care of this, we extend the original functions Ψ if necessary. Then, we have that if $\Psi \in [\Psi_j^L, \Psi_j^U]$ and $\|\alpha - \alpha_i\| \leqslant \varepsilon_2$ then

$$\Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) \leqslant \Psi(\alpha^T x) \leqslant \Psi_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_2 R)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and hence these pairs (i, j) form brackets on the larger family $\Psi(\alpha^T x)$. We now need to obtain a bound for the new brackets

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_2 R) - \Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) \Big)^2 dx \right)^{1/2}. \tag{7.46}$$

It follows from the Minkowski inequality that an upper bound for (7.46) is

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) - \Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) \Big)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi_j^U(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_2 R) - \Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_2 R) \Big)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad\quad + \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_2 R) - \Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) \Big)^2 dx \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.47}$$

Using the fact that for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ there exists a $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ such that the jth component of α is greater than $1/\sqrt{d}$ in absolute value, we can assume without generality that the first component of α_i satisfies this property. Hence, using the change of variable $t_1 = \alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R$ and $t_j = x_j, j = 2, \ldots, d$ as well as $t_1 \in [-2R, 2R]$ and $t_j \in [-R, R]$ for $j = 2, \ldots, d$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) - \Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) \Big)^2 dx &\leqslant \sqrt{d}(2R)^{d-1} \int_{-2R}^{2R} \Big(\Psi(t) - \Psi_j^L(t) \Big)^2 dt \\ &\leqslant \sqrt{d}(2R)^{d-1} \varepsilon_1^2, \end{aligned}$$

and the same bound is found for the square of the second integral in (7.47). Similarly,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Big(\Psi(\alpha_i^T x + \varepsilon_2 R) - \Psi(\alpha_i^T x - \varepsilon_2 R) \Big)^2 dx \quad\leqslant\quad \sqrt{d}(2R)^{d-1} \int_{-2R}^{2R} \Big(\Psi(t) - \Psi(t - 2\varepsilon_2 R) \Big)^2 dt.$$

Finally, using the monotonicity of Ψ (extended to a larger interval) and the fact that it is bounded

by K, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-2R}^{2R}\Big(\Psi(t)-\Psi(t-2\varepsilon_2 R)\Big)^2dt &\leqslant 2K\left(\int_{-2R}^{2R}\Psi(t)dt-\int_{-2R-2\varepsilon_2 R}^{2R-2\varepsilon_2 R}\Psi(t)dt\right)\\ &= 2K\left(\int_{-2R-2\varepsilon_2 R}^{2R}\Psi(t)dt-\int_{-2R-2\varepsilon_2 R}^{-2R}\Psi(t)dt\right)\\ &\leqslant 8K^2\varepsilon_2 R.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above results yields

$$\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(\Psi_j^U(\alpha_i^T x+\varepsilon_2 R)-\Psi_j^L(\alpha_i^T x-\varepsilon_2 R)\Big)^2dx\right)^{1/2} \leqslant C_{R,d}\left\{\varepsilon_1^2+K^2\varepsilon_2\right\}^{1/2}$$

where $C_{R,d}>0$ depends only on R and d. We therefore set $\varepsilon_1^2=K^2\varepsilon_2$ and $\varepsilon_2=\varepsilon^2(2C_{R,d}^2K^2)^{-1}$ so that the bound in the previous inequality is equal to ε. This specifies the choice of $\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2$ in the coverings, and we also need to worry about the overall size of the space δ. Since $0<\varepsilon\leqslant\delta$, we will choose $\varepsilon_1^2\leqslant\delta_1^2=K^2\delta_2$ and $\varepsilon_2\leqslant\delta_2=\delta^2(2C_{R,d}^2K^2)^{-1}$. We now check that this choice is appropriate. Recall the meaning of δ: we have that

$$\left\{\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(\Psi(\alpha^T x)-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\Big)^2dx\right\}^{1/2}\leqslant\delta.$$

Similarly to our calculations above, we can show that (changed here to squared version from previous calculations)

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(\Psi(\alpha^T x)-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\Big)^2dx\\ &\quad\leqslant 2\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(\Psi(\alpha^T x)-\Psi_0(\alpha^T x)\Big)^2dx+2\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(\Psi_0(\alpha^T x)-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\Big)^2dx\end{aligned}$$

where for all x,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\Psi_0(\alpha^T x)-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\Big)^2\\ &\quad\leqslant \Big(\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x+\delta_2 R)-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\Big)^2+\Big(\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x-\delta_2 R)-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\Big)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Using the same changes of variables as above, we conclude that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}}\Big(\Psi(\alpha^T x)-\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\Big)^2dx \leqslant C_{R,d}^2\left\{\delta_1^2+K^2\delta_2\right\} = \delta^2.$$

It therefore follows that

$$\begin{aligned}H_B(\varepsilon,\mathcal{G}_{IK\delta},\|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}) &\leqslant H_B\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}C_{R,d}},\mathcal{M}_{(2I)K}^{\Psi_0}\left(\frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}C_{R,d}}\right),\|\cdot\|_{2,2I}\right)\\ &\quad+H_B\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2K^2C_{R,d}^2},\mathcal{S}_{d-1}\left(\frac{\delta^2}{2C_{R,d}^2K^2}\right),\|\cdot\|\right)\end{aligned}$$

where the second entropy on the right hand side is at most

$$H_B\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2K^2C_{R,d}^2},\mathcal{S}_{d-1},\|\cdot\|\right),$$

since $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}(\delta_2) \subset \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. Next, we use the results of Corollary 7.2 and Lemma 4.8 to explicitly calculate these bounds:

$$H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_{IK\delta}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}) \lesssim \kappa\left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right)\log\left(\frac{2\sqrt{\kappa|I|}K\sqrt{2}C_{R,d}}{\varepsilon}\right) + \log\left(\frac{K}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

By the assumptions of the Lemma, we also have that $\kappa \geqslant 1$, $\varepsilon \leqslant \delta \leqslant K^{-1} \leqslant e^{-1}$. Hence, it follows from Lemma 7.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} H_B(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}_{[-R,R]K\delta}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\mathcal{X}}) &\lesssim \kappa\left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right)\log\left(\frac{2^{3/2}C_{R,d}K\sqrt{\kappa|I|}}{\varepsilon}\right) + \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right)\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\delta}\right), \\ &\lesssim \kappa\left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right)\log\left(\frac{(2^{3/2}C_{R,d}|I|^{1/2}+1)(K\sqrt{\kappa})}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\lesssim \kappa\left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}\right)\log\left(\frac{K\sqrt{\kappa}}{\varepsilon}\right), \end{aligned}$$

using that $\kappa \geqslant 1$ and $\delta \leqslant 1/(2^{3/2}C_{R,d}|I|^{1/2}+1)$ for the two last inequalities. □

Proof of Lemma 7.8. Using change of variable with $s = \log(1/x)$ first and integration by parts second, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\frac{1}{x}\log\frac{1}{x}}dx &= -\int_\infty^{\log(1/\delta)} s^{1/2}e^{-s/2}ds \\ &= \int_{\log(1/\delta)}^\infty s^{1/2}e^{-s/2}ds \\ &= (-2)\int_{\log(1/\delta)}^\infty s^{1/2}\left\{\frac{-1}{2}e^{-s/2}\right\}ds \\ &= (-2)\left\{s^{1/2}e^{-s/2}\Big|_{\log(1/\delta)}^\infty - \int_{\log(1/\delta)}^\infty \frac{1}{2}s^{-1/2}e^{-s/2}ds\right\} \\ &= (-2)\left\{0 - \sqrt{\delta\log(1/\delta)} - \int_{\log(1/\delta)}^\infty \frac{1}{2}s^{-1/2}e^{-s/2}ds\right\} \\ &= 2\sqrt{\delta\log(1/\delta)} + \int_{\log(1/\delta)}^\infty s^{-1/2}e^{-s/2}ds. \end{aligned}$$

We now use change of variable again ($u^2 = s$), to find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\log(1/\delta)}^\infty s^{-1/2}e^{-s/2}ds &= 2\int_{\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}}^\infty e^{-u^2/2}du \\ &= 2\sqrt{2\pi}P(Z > \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}) \end{aligned}$$

where Z has a standard Gaussian distribution. Therefore, using Chernoff's inequality and the above calculations,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\frac{1}{x}\log\frac{1}{x}}dx &= 2\sqrt{\delta\log(1/\delta)} + 2\sqrt{2\pi}P(Z > \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}) \\ &\leqslant 2\sqrt{\delta\log(1/\delta)} + 2\sqrt{2\pi}\exp\left\{-0.5(\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)})^2\right\} \\ &= 2\sqrt{\delta\log(1/\delta)} + 2\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{\delta} \\ &\overset{\delta\leqslant e^{-1}}{\leqslant} 2(1+\sqrt{2\pi})\sqrt{\delta\log(1/\delta)}, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

8. Appendix B: Additional proofs

8.1. Proof of Proposition 2.1

For an arbitrary pair (i,j) with $i \neq j$, the total space $\mathbb{R}^d$ is separated into three disjoint parts: (1) the hyperplane H_{ij} of all vectors $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\alpha^T(X_i - X_j) = 0$, (2) the open half-space S_{ij}^+ such that $\alpha^T X_i > \alpha^T X_j$ for all $\alpha \in S_{ij}^+$, and (3) the open half-space S_{ij}^- such that $\alpha^T X_i < \alpha^T X_j$ for all $\alpha \in S_{ij}^-$. There are finitely many such hyperplanes. We call a subset $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ a *maximal region* if $\mathcal{R} \cap H_{ij}$ is empty for all $i \neq j$, but with $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ the closure of $\mathcal{R}$, $\overline{\mathcal{R}} \backslash \mathcal{R}$ is included in the union of all hyperplanes H_{ij}. Note that a maximal region is an open convex cone of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, $\mathcal{S}^X$ is the intersection of $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ with the (finite) union of all possible maximal regions in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

We will prove that for arbitrary $i \neq j$ and $\alpha \in H_{ij} \cap \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, we can find $\alpha_k \in \mathcal{S}^X$ with

$$h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^{\alpha}, \alpha) \geqslant h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^{\alpha_k}, \alpha_k). \tag{8.48}$$

We can find a maximal region $\mathcal{R}$ and a sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\alpha_k \in \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ for all k and $\alpha_k \to \alpha$ as $k \to \infty$. We have $m_{\alpha_k} = m$ since $\alpha_k \in \mathcal{S}^X$, for all k. Moreover, there exists a (unique) permutation $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}$ such that

$$\alpha_k^T X_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(1)} < \alpha_k^T X_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(2)} < \cdots < \alpha_k^T X_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(m)}.$$

Denote by l_1 and l_2 the indices such that $i = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(l_1)$ and $j = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(l_2)$. We have $\alpha^T X_i = \alpha^T X_j$ since $\alpha \in H_{ij}$ and therefore, letting $k \to \infty$ yields

$$\alpha^T X_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(1)} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \alpha^T X_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(l_1)} = \cdots = \alpha^T X_{\sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(l_2)} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \alpha^T X_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(m)}. \tag{8.49}$$

Since $\widehat{\Psi}_n^{\alpha_k}$ minimizes $h_n(\Psi, \alpha_k)$ over $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}$, rearranging the terms in the sum yields

$$h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^{\alpha_k}, \alpha_k) = \inf_{\eta_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \eta_m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} n_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(i)} \left\{ Y_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(i)} - \eta_i \right\}^2 \tag{8.50}$$

for all k whereas because of (8.49),

$$h_n(\widehat{\Psi}_n^{\alpha}, \alpha) = \inf_{\eta_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \eta_{l_1} = \cdots = \eta_{l_2} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \eta_m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} n_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(i)} \left\{ Y_{\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(i)} - \eta_i \right\}^2.$$

The above infimum is taken over a restricted set as compared to (8.50), so we conclude that (8.48) holds for all k. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.1. □

8.2. Proof of Proposition 3.1

Using the notation of Section 2, we have

$$\ell_n(\Psi, \alpha) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m_\alpha} n_i^{\alpha} \left\{ Y_i^{\alpha} \ell\left[\Psi(Z_i^{\alpha})\right] - B \circ \ell\left[\Psi(Z_i^{\alpha})\right] \right\} \tag{8.51}$$

for all α and Ψ. For a fixed $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, setting $\eta_i = \Psi(Z_i^\alpha)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m_\alpha$, we define

$$\Theta \quad = \quad \{\eta = (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_{m_\alpha})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m_\alpha} \,|\, a < \eta_1 \leqslant \eta_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \eta_{m_\alpha} < b\}$$

and we rewrite the optimisation problem over $\mathcal{M}$ as maximizing $\mathcal{L}(\eta)$ over $\eta \in \Theta$ where

$$\mathcal{L}(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{m_\alpha} n_i^\alpha \left\{ Y_i^\alpha \ell(\eta_i) - B \circ \ell\,(\eta_i) \right\}.$$

Recall that $B' = \ell^{-1}$ (see Proposition 8.1 below) is increasing. Hence, for all i such that $Y_i^\alpha \in (a, b)$, the function $x \mapsto Y_i^\alpha x - B\,(x)$ is concave on $(\ell(a), \ell(b))$ with a first derivative that vanishes at the point $x = \ell(Y_i^\alpha)$. This means that the function $\eta \mapsto Y_i^\alpha \ell(\eta) - B \circ \ell\,(\eta)$ achieves it maximal value at the point $\eta = Y_i^\alpha$. Now, for all i such that $Y_i^\alpha = a$ (which could happen only if a is finite), the function $\eta \mapsto Y_i^\alpha \ell(\eta) - B \circ \ell\,(\eta)$ is decreasing on (a, b) and its maximal value is

$$\lim_{\eta \downarrow a} \{a\ell(\eta) - B \circ \ell\,(\eta)\},$$

which is finite by assumption. Hence, the maximum is achieved as $\eta \downarrow a = Y_i^\alpha$. Similarly, for all i such that $Y_i^\alpha = b$, the maximum of function $\eta \mapsto Y_i^\alpha \ell(\eta) - B \circ \ell\,(\eta)$ is achieved as $\eta \uparrow b = Y_i^\alpha$. We conclude from the preceding arguments that for all $\eta \in \Theta$, we have $\mathcal{L}(\eta) \leqslant \mathcal{L}(\overline{\eta})$ where $\overline{\eta} \in \Theta$ is the truncated version of η defined by

$$\overline{\eta}_i = \min(\max(\eta_i, c), C),$$

where $c = \min_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant m_\alpha} \{Y_i^\alpha\}$ and $C = \max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant m_\alpha} \{Y_i^\alpha\}$. Hence, with

$$\Theta_1 \quad = \quad \{\eta = (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_{m_\alpha})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m_\alpha} \,|\, c \leqslant \eta_1 \leqslant \eta_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \eta_{m_\alpha} \leqslant C\}$$

we conclude that

$$\sup_{\eta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}(\eta) = \sup_{\eta \in \Theta_1} \mathcal{L}(\eta). \tag{8.52}$$

But Θ_1 is a non-empty compact set in $\mathbb{R}^{m_\alpha}$ since c and C are finite, so the above supremum is achieved on Θ_1. Using the connection between $\mathcal{L}$ and ℓ_n, this means that there exists $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ that takes values in $[c, C]$ such that

$$\inf_{\Psi \in \mathcal{M}} \ell_n(\Psi, \alpha) = \ell_n(\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha, \alpha).$$

Now, we characterize the solution $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha$ (which is not unique). Note that all functions in $\mathcal{M}$ that agree with $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha$ at Z_i^α for all $i = 1, \ldots, m_\alpha$ are minimizers of $\ell_n(\Psi, \alpha)$ over $\Psi \in \mathcal{M}$. For convenience, we consider in the sequel the stepwise solution which takes a constant value between the jump points, is left-continuous and takes constants values on $(-\infty, Z_1^\alpha]$ and $[Z_{m_\alpha}^\alpha, \infty)$. To characterize $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha$ (i.e., to characterize $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_i^\alpha)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m_\alpha$), fix ε and consider for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ the perturbation function

$$\Psi_\varepsilon(z) = \ell^{-1}\left(\ell\left(\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(z)\right) - \varepsilon \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty, x]}(z)\right),$$

for all z. If $\varepsilon > 0$ then $\Psi_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{M}$ and hence $\left(\ell_n(\Psi_\varepsilon, \alpha) - \ell_n(\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha, \alpha)\right)/\varepsilon \geqslant 0$ which yields when $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m_\alpha} n_i^\alpha \left\{ Y_i^\alpha - B' \circ \ell\left(\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_i^\alpha)\right)\right\} \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty, x]}(Z_i^\alpha) \geqslant 0.$$

Because $B' = \ell^{-1}$, this can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m_\alpha} n_i^\alpha \left\{ Y_i^\alpha - \widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_i^\alpha) \right\} \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,x]}(Z_i^\alpha) \geqslant 0.$$

In case x is a jump point of $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha$, we have $\Psi_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{M}$ provided that $|\varepsilon|$ is very small. Passing to the limit, we obtain for such an x that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m_\alpha} n_i^\alpha \left\{ Y_i^\alpha - \widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_i^\alpha) \right\} \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,x]}(Z_i^\alpha) = 0.$$

Hence, $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_1^\alpha) \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_{m_\alpha}^\alpha)$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j} n_i^\alpha \left\{ Y_i^\alpha - \widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_i^\alpha) \right\} \geqslant 0$$

for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, m_\alpha\}$, with an equality if $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_j^\alpha) < \widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_{j+1}^\alpha)$. The equality condition comes from the fact that, as we consider a left-continuous solution $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha$, a given x is a jump point if and only if $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(x) < \lim_{y \downarrow x} \widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(y)$. This means that $(\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_1^\alpha), \ldots \widehat{\Psi}^\alpha(Z_{m_\alpha}^\alpha))$ are the left derivatives of $\widehat{\mathbb{Y}^\alpha}$.

Conversely, if a function $\widehat{\Psi}^\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfies (2.5), then it agrees with a minimizer at Z_i^α for all $i = 1, \ldots, m_\alpha$, which implies that it is itself a minimizer. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1. □

8.3. *Proof of Proposition 5.1*

Consider vectors α and β in $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, and non-constant functions $f \in \mathcal{M}_\alpha$ and $h \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ that satisfy $f(\alpha^T X) = h(\beta^T X)$ *a.s.* and are both left-continuous (the right-continuous case can be treated likewise) with no discontinuity point at the boundary of their domain. To prove Proposition 5.1, it suffices to show that in such a case, we necessarily have $\alpha = \beta$ and $f = h$ on $\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \mathcal{C}_\beta$. We prove below that we indeed have $\alpha = \beta$ and $f = h$.

By assumption we have $f(\alpha^T x) = h(\beta^T x)$ for almost all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ in the Lebesgue sense. Using left-continuity of both f and h, we conclude that the equality in the previous display holds for all x in the interior of $\mathcal{X}$. If we could prove that $\alpha = \beta$, this would imply that $f = h$ on the interior of $\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \mathcal{C}_\beta$. By continuity of both f and h at the boundaries of their domain, this would imply that $f = h$ on $\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \mathcal{C}_\beta$.

Hence, it suffices to show that $\alpha = \beta$. To show that $\alpha = \beta$, we first notice that because of the convexity of $\mathcal{X}$, for small enough $L > 0$ we can find an open ball $\mathcal{B}$ with radius L included in $\mathcal{X}$ on which $x \mapsto f(\alpha^T x)$ is not constant. We then have

$$f(\alpha^T x) = h(\beta^T x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{8.53}$$

Without loss of generality (possibly replacing $f(z)$ by $f(z - \alpha^T x_0)$ and $h(z)$ by $h(z - \beta^T x_0)$ with x_0 being the center of the ball), we assume that $\mathcal{B}$ is the open ball with center $x_0 = 0$ and radius L.

Assume $\beta \notin \{\alpha, -\alpha\}$ (which implicitly assumes that $d \geqslant 2$). We will show that this yields a contradiction. The vectors β and α are linearly independent so it follows from the Cauchy-Swcharz inequality, where the equality case is excluded, that $\alpha^T \beta < 1$. With $v = \beta - \alpha$, we then have $v^T \alpha = \beta^T \alpha - 1 < 0$. Hence, for all $a \in [0, L)$ we have

$$f(a) = f(\alpha^T(a\alpha)) = h(\beta^T(a\alpha)) = h(\alpha^T(a\alpha) + v^T(a\alpha)) \leqslant h(a),$$

using (8.53) combined to the monotonicity of h. Likewise, $v^T\beta > 0$ and therefore,

$$h(a) = h(\beta^T(a\beta)) = f(\alpha^T(a\beta)) = f(\beta^T(a\beta) - v^T(a\beta)) \leqslant f(a)$$

for all $a \in [0, L)$, whence $h(a) = f(a)$ for all $a \in [0, L)$. Similarly, $f(-a) = h(-a)$ for all $a \in [0, L)$, whence $f = h$ on $(-L, L)$. Combining this with (8.53) we arrive at

$$f(\alpha^T x) = f(\beta^T x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{8.54}$$

Since $x \mapsto f(\alpha^T x)$ is not constant on $\mathcal{B}$, there exists a point $b \in (-L, L)$ of strict increase of f. The ball $\mathcal{B}$ can be chosen in such a way that $b \neq 0$. Either we have $f(b+\varepsilon) > f(b)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, L-b)$, or we have $f(b-\varepsilon) < f(b)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, L+b)$. We assume that $f(b+\varepsilon) > f(b)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, L-b)$. The other case can be handled likewise. In the case where $b > 0$, with $x = (b+\varepsilon)\beta$, we have $x \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\alpha^T x \leqslant b$ for sufficiently small ε, using that $\alpha^T\beta < 1$. Hence, $f(\alpha^T x) \leqslant f(b) < f(b+\varepsilon) = f(\beta^T x)$ by monotonicity of f, which yields a contradiction with (8.54). In the case $b < 0$, consider ε sufficiently small so that $b + \varepsilon < 0$. Then, with $x = b\alpha$ we have $x \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\beta^T x \geqslant b + \varepsilon$ for sufficiently small ε. Hence, $f(\alpha^T x) = f(b) < f(b+\varepsilon) \leqslant f(\beta^T x)$ which again, yields a contradiction. This means that $\beta \in \{\alpha, -\alpha\}$.

Assume $\beta = -\alpha$. We will show that this yields again a contradiction. For all $a \in [0, L)$ we have

$$f(a) = f(\alpha^T(a\alpha)) = h(\beta^T(a\alpha)) = h(-a),$$

using (8.53) with $\beta = -\alpha$. This means that $f(a) = h(-a)$. Likewise, $h(a) = f(-a)$. By monotonicity of h we then have

$$f(a) = h(-a) \leqslant h(a) = f(-a).$$

As f is non-decreasing, this means that $f(a) = f(-a)$ for all $a \in [0, L)$. Hence, f is constant on $(-L, L)$, which yields a contradiction. This means that $\beta \neq -\alpha$. We have proved that $\beta \in \{\alpha, -\alpha\}$, hence $\alpha = \beta$. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1. □

8.4. *Proof of Theorem 5.2*

Assumption A4 together with Theorem 4.1 implies that

$$\int \left(\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\right)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) = o_p(1).$$

Since convergence in probability is equivalent to the property that each subsequence has a further subsequence along which the convergence holds with probability one, we assume in the sequel without loss of generality (possibly arguing along subsequences) that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int \left(\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\right)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) = 0 \tag{8.55}$$

with probability one. We will show that (8.55) implies (5.22) and (5.23) with an almost sure convergence, whence the theorem follows.

In order to use compactness arguments, we consider a truncated version of $\widehat{\Psi}_n$, where we recall that $\widehat{\Psi}_n$ denotes the LSE extended monotonically to the whole real line: we consider $\bar{\Psi}_n$ such that

$$\bar{\Psi}_n(t) = \begin{cases} \widehat{\Psi}_n(t) & \text{if } \widehat{\Psi}_n(t) \in (K_-, K_+) \\ K_+ & \text{if } \widehat{\Psi}_n(t) \geqslant K_+ \\ K_- & \text{if } \widehat{\Psi}_n(t) \leqslant K_- \end{cases}.$$

where K_+ denotes the largest value of Ψ_0 whereas K_- denotes the smallest value of Ψ_0.

We argue along paths, which means that ω is considered as fixed here and such that (8.55) holds. For all n, the function $\bar{\Psi}_n$ is monotone, left-continuous (because $\widehat{\Psi}_n$ itself is left-continuous) and bounded by $\max\{K_+, -K_-\}$ in sup-norm. Hence, similar to Lemma 2.5 in van der Vaart (1998), each subsequence of $(\bar{\Psi}_n)_{n\geqslant 0}$ possesses a further subsequence along which $\bar{\Psi}_n$ converges pointwise to a left-continuous monotone function m_0 say, at each of its point of continuity. The function m_0 possesses right-limits at every point. Because $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ belongs to the compact set $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ for all n, we can extract a further subsequence along which $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ converges in the $\mathbb{R}^d$-Euclidean distance to some vector $a_0 \in \mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. For simplicity, we denote the general term of the subsequence by $(\bar{\Psi}_n, \widehat{\alpha}_n)$. We aim to show that $m_0 = \Psi_0$ and that $a_0 = \alpha_0$. For this task, consider the L_2-distance

$$\int \left(m_0(a_0^T x) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\right)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \leqslant 3I_{n,1} + 3I_{n,2} + 3I_{n,3} \tag{8.56}$$

where

$$I_{n,1} = \int \left(m_0(a_0^T x) - m_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x)\right)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \quad , \quad I_{n,2} = \int \left(\bar{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\right)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x)$$
$$I_{n,3} = \int \left(m_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \bar{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x)\right)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x).$$

We will show that $I_{n,j}$ tends to zero as $n \to \infty$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$ to conclude that the L_2-distance on the left-hand side of (8.56) equals zero. To deal with $I_{n,1}$, we use the fact that because m_0 is monotone, the set of its discontinuity points is countable and hence has $\mathbb{Q}$-measure zero. This means that $I_{n,1}$ can be viewed as an integral over the set of continuity points of m_0. At the continuity points of m_0 we have $m_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) \to m_0(a_0^T x)$ as $n \to \infty$ so it follows from the dominated convergence theorem that $I_{n,1}$ converges to zero as $n \to \infty$. Next, it follows from the definition of $\bar{\Psi}_n$ that

$$I_{n,2} \leqslant \int \left(\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\right)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x).$$

Hence, with (8.55) we conclude that $I_{n,2} \to 0$. Finally, with R taken from (4.19) and Q_n the distribution of $\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X$, where X is independent of the data points $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$, we have

$$I_{n,3} = \int \left(m_0(t) - \bar{\Psi}_n(t)\right)^2 dQ_n(t) \leqslant A \int_{-R}^{R} \left(m_0(t) - \bar{\Psi}_n(t)\right)^2 dt$$

for some $A > 0$, using that X has a bounded density function. Because m_0 is monotone, the set of its discontinuity points is countable and hence has Lebesgue measure zero. Because of the convergence of $\bar{\Psi}_n$ at each continuity point of m_0 we conclude from the dominated convergence theorem that $I_{n,3}$ converges to zero as $n \to \infty$. This means that the three terms on the right-hand side of (8.56) tends to zero as $n \to \infty$ and therefore,

$$\int \left(m_0(a_0^T x) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x)\right)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) = 0.$$

Possibly modifying m_0 so that its restriction to $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$ has no discontinuity point at the boundaries of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$, which does not modify the value of the above integral, we conclude from Proposition 5.1 that $a_0 = \alpha_0$ and $m_0 = \Psi_0$ with possible exception at the boundaries of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$. From the calculations above, it follows that $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ converges to α_0 and $\bar{\Psi}_n$ converges pointwise to Ψ_0 on the interior of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$ with probability one. Hence with probability one,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{t\in I} |\bar{\Psi}_n(t) - \Psi_0(t)| = 0$$

for all compact interval I included in the interior of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$. Uniformity of the convergence follows from continuity of Ψ_0 together with monotonicity of the functions involved. Let I be such that $K_- < \Psi_0(t) < K_+$ for all $t \in I$. For almost all ω, we then have $\bar{\Psi}_n = \widehat{\Psi}_n$ on I for all large enough n and therefore,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{t\in I} |\widehat{\Psi}_n(t) - \Psi_0(t)| = 0$$

with probability one. Theorem 5.2 follows. □

8.5. *Proof of Corollary 5.3*

Proof. Borrowing, from (Murphy et al., 1999, Lemma 5.7, page 418) we have that for any random variable X, if $(E[g_1(X)g_2(X)])^2 \leqslant cE[g_1^2(X)]E[g_2^2(X)]$ for $c \leqslant 1$, then

$$E[(g_1(X) + g_2(X))^2] \quge (1 - \sqrt{c})(E[g_1(X)^2] + E[g_2(X)^2]). \tag{8.57}$$

Note that in the expectations, with $\mathbb{P}_X$ denoting the distribution of X, $E[g_1(X)] = \int g_1(x)d\mathbb{P}_X(x)$ and so on - that is, the expectations should be viewed as short-hand notation for the integral in the x-variable.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote a subset of $\mathcal{X}$ to be chosen later such that $\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A}) > 0$. In order to adapt the above result to our problem, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{A}} (\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) &= \int_{\mathcal{A}} (g_1(x) + g_2(x))^2 \, d\mathbb{Q}(x) \\ &= E[(g_1(X_{\mathcal{A}}) + g_2(X_{\mathcal{A}}))^2] \times \mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A})\end{aligned}$$

where $g_1(x) = \widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) = \widetilde{g}_1(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x)$, $g_2(x) = \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - g_0(x)$ and $X_{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes here a random variable with density function $x \mapsto q(x)\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{A}}(x)/\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A})$. To alleviate the notation, in the sequel we simply write X instead of $X_{\mathcal{A}}$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}E[g_1(X)g_2(X)]^2 &= E[\widetilde{g}_1(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)g_2(X)]^2 \\ &= E[\widetilde{g}_1(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)E[g_2(X)|\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X]]^2 \\ &\leqslant E[\widetilde{g}_1^2(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)]E\left[E[g_2(X)|\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X]^2\right],\end{aligned}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Hence,

$$E[g_1(X)g_2(X)]^2 \leqslant c_n E[g_1^2(X)]E[g_2^2(X)].$$

where

$$c_n = \frac{E\left[\left(\Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X) - E[\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)|\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X]\right)^2\right]}{E\left[\left(\Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)\right)^2\right]}.$$

Using (8.57) with $c = c_n$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{A}} (\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \quge (1 - \sqrt{c_n}) \Big\{ &E\left[(\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X) - \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X))^2\right] \\ &+ E\left[(\Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X))^2\right]\Big\} \times \mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A}).\end{aligned} \tag{8.58}$$

Note that c_n depends on $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ and is therefore random in the data. We will prove below that there exists some real number $c \in (0,1)$ such that from any subsequence, we can extract a further subsequence along which $\limsup_{n\to\infty} c_n \leqslant c < 1$ with probability one. This means that

$$(1 - \sqrt{c_n})^{-1} = O_p(1). \tag{8.59}$$

since convergence in probability is equivalent to the property that each subsequence has a further subsequence along which the convergence holds with probability one.

Consider an arbitrary subsequence. Define $r_n = \|\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0\|$ and $\gamma_n = (\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0)/r_n$. Because γ_n belongs to the compact set $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$, we can extract a subsequence along which γ_n converges in probability to a limit, γ say. By Theorem 5.2, we can extract a further subsequence (that we still index by n to alleviate the notation) along which $\widehat{\alpha}_n, \gamma_n$ converges to α_0, γ with probability one. This means that we can extract a subsequence along which both $\widehat{\alpha}_n(\omega) \to \alpha_0$ and $\gamma_n(\omega) \to \gamma(\omega)$ for almost all paths ω. In the sequel, we argue with such a path ω fixed. Hence, $\widehat{\alpha}_n$ and γ_n can be considered as non random and we search for bounds that do not depend on the chosen path ω. We denote by x_0 a point in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $z_0 = \alpha_0^T x_0$ where z_0 is taken from Assumption A5 and we consider $\varepsilon > 0$ such that Ψ_0 is continuously differentiable over $\mathcal{V} := [z_0 - 2\varepsilon, z_0 + 2\varepsilon]$ with a derivative that is bounded both from above and away from zero on $\mathcal{V}$. Note that the derivative is uniformly continuous on the compact set $\mathcal{V}$. Furthermore, we denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the Euclidean ball with center x_0 and radius ε. Note that for large enough n, we then have $\alpha_0^T x \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x \in \mathcal{V}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

We have that

$$\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x) = \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) + \Psi_0'(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x)(\alpha_0 - \widehat{\alpha}_n)^T x + o(r_n) \tag{8.60}$$

uniformly for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$ since $|(\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0)^T x| \leqslant r_n \|x\|$ where $\|x\| \leqslant \|x_0\| + \varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[\left(\Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X) - E[\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)|\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X]\right)^2\right] \\ &= E\left[\left(E\left[\{\Psi_0'(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)(\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0)^T X + o(r_n)\}\middle|\, \widehat{\alpha}_n^T X\right]\right)^2\right] \\ &= E\left[\left(E\left[\Psi_0'(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)(\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0)^T X\middle|\, \widehat{\alpha}_n^T X\right]\right)^2\right] + o(r_n^2) + E_{n,1} \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that X denotes here $X_{\mathcal{A}}$, a random variable supported on $\mathcal{A}$, and

$$|E_{n,1}| = 2o(r_n)|E\left[\Psi_0'(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)(\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0)^T X)\right]| = o(r_n^2),$$

again by (A5). Similarly, we have

$$E\left[\left(\Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T X)\right)^2\right] = E\left[\left(\Psi_0'(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)(\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0)^T X\right)^2\right] + o(r_n^2).$$

Combining these calculations, we arrive at

$$c_n = \frac{E\left[\left(\Psi_0'(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)\gamma_n^T E\left[X|\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X\right]\right)^2\right] + o(1)}{E\left[\left(\Psi_0'(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X)\gamma_n^T X\right)^2\right] + o(1)}.$$

Lemma 8.2 in the Appendix shows that $E[X|\widehat{\alpha}_n^T X] \longrightarrow E[X|\alpha_0^T X]$ almost surely. This, along with continuity of Ψ_0' and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem (since $|X| \leqslant \|x_0\| + \varepsilon$ almost surely), implies that c_n converges with

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} c_n &= \frac{E\left[(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X)\gamma^T E[X|\alpha_0^T X])^2\right]}{E\left[\left(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X)\gamma^T X\right)^2\right]} \\ &= \frac{\gamma^T E\left[(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X))^2 E[X|\alpha_0^T X]E[X|\alpha_0^T X]^T\right]\gamma}{\gamma^T E\left[(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X))^2 XX^T\right]\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, $\|\widehat{\alpha}_n\|^2 = \|\alpha_0 + r_n\gamma_n\|^2$ and therefore, $1 = ||\alpha_0||^2 + r_n^2 + 2r_n\langle\alpha_0, \gamma_n\rangle$, which implies that $\langle\alpha_0, \gamma_n\rangle = -r_n/2 \to 0$ since $\|\alpha_0\|^2 = 1$. Since $\gamma = \lim_{n\to\infty}\gamma_n$, this implies that $\langle\alpha_0, \gamma\rangle = 0$ and therefore, $\lim_{n\to\infty} c_n \leqslant c$ where

$$c = \sup_{\|\gamma\|=1,\langle\gamma,\alpha_0\rangle=0} \frac{\gamma^T E\left[(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X))^2 E[X|\alpha_0^T X]E[X|\alpha_0^T X]^T\right]\gamma}{\gamma^T E\left[(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X))^2 XX^T\right]\gamma}$$

does not depend on the chosen path ω. It remains to prove that $c < 1$. Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X))^2 XX^T\right] &= E\left[(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X))^2 E[X|\alpha_0^T X]E[X|\alpha_0^T X]^T\right] \\ &\quad + E\left[(\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X))^2 (X - E[X|\alpha_0^T X])(X - E[X|\alpha_0^T X])^T\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Psi_0'(\alpha_0^T X)$ is bounded below, our goal is now to show that the null-space of the matrix $E\left[(X - E[X|\alpha_0^T X])(X - E[X|\alpha_0^T X])^T\right]$ is spanned by α_0 only, as this will imply that $c < 1$.

To this end, consider any γ_0 perpendicular to α_0 with $\|\gamma_0\| = 1$. Let A_0 denote the matrix with first row α_0^T and second row γ_0^T and let $Z = A_0 X$. Since X has an everywhere-positive density, so does Z. To see this, take $Z' = A_0' X$ where A_0' is a $d \times d$ invertible matrix such that A_0' has its first two rows equal to A_0. (Such a matrix exists since γ_0 and α_0 are perpendicular and hence linearly independent.) Then Z' has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure which can be explicitly calculated using the Jacobian formula and its marginal gives the density of Z, f_Z say. Now,

$$\gamma_0^T E\left[(X - E[X|\alpha_0^T X])(X - E[X|\alpha_0^T X])^T\right]\gamma_0 = E\left[(\gamma_0^T X - E[\gamma_0^T X|\alpha_0^T X])^2\right].$$

This equals zero iff $\gamma_0^T X = E[\gamma_0^T X|\alpha_0^T X]$ almost surely, or, $Z_2 = E[Z_2|Z_1]$ almost surely. However, this means that the distribution of Z is concentrated on a one-dimensional subspace of Z, which cannot hold since Z has an everywhere-positive Lebesgue density. This finally shows that $\lim_{n\to\infty} c_n \leqslant c < 1$.

Then, if follows from (8.58) that we can find $c' > 0$ and $c'' > 0$ independent on n and ω such that for large n,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{A}} (\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) &\geqslant c' \int_{\mathcal{A}} (\Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \\ &\geqslant c'' \int_{\mathcal{A}} ((\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0)^T x)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \\ &\geqslant c''\|\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0\|^2 \inf_{\beta\in\mathcal{S}_{d-1}} \int_{\mathcal{A}} (\beta^T x)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x), \end{aligned}$$

by definition of $\mathcal{A}$. The infimum above does not depend on the chosen path ω and is achieved at a point β_0, say, by continuity of the function $\beta \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{A}} (\beta^T x)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x)$ on the compact set $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$. Hence,

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}} (\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \geqslant c''\|\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0\|^2 \int_{\mathcal{A}} (\beta_0^T x)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x).$$

The integral on the right-hand side is strictly positive since $\mathbb{Q}$ has a density function that is everywhere-positive positive on $\mathcal{A}$. This means that there exists $K > 0$ such that from each subsequence, we can extract a further subsequence along which

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0\|^2 &\leqslant K \int_{\mathcal{A}} (\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \\ &\leqslant K \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\widehat{g}_n(x) - g_0(x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \end{aligned}$$

for large n, with probability one. Since the right-hand side is of order $O_p(n^{-2/3})$ by Theorem 4.1, this implies that $\|\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0\| = O_p(n^{-1/3})$.

In the sequel, we assume that Ψ_0 has a derivative bounded from above on $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0}$ and we extend Ψ_0 to the whole real line in such a way that the extension has a bounded derivative on $\mathbb{R}$. We assume without loss of generality that $|\alpha_{0,1}| \leqslant d^{-1/2}$ and therefore, $|\widehat{\alpha}_{n,1}| \leqslant 2d^{-1/2}$ with probability that tends to one. Then, with $\underline{q}$ from (4.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) &\geqslant \underline{q} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x))^2 dx \\ &= \frac{\underline{q}}{\widehat{\alpha}_{n,1}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\widehat{\alpha}_n} \times \mathcal{X}_{d-1}} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(t_1) - \Psi_0(t_1))^2 dt_1 \cdots dt_n,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{X}_{d-1} = \{(x_2, \ldots, x_d) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\widehat{\alpha}_n} = \{\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, using the change of variable $t_1 = \widehat{\alpha}_n^T x$ and $t_j = x_j$ for $j = 2, \ldots, d$. Since

$$\widehat{\alpha}_{n,1}^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{X}_{d-1}} dt_2 \cdots dt_n \geqslant \frac{d^{1/2}}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}_{d-1}} dt_2 \cdots dt_n > 0,$$

there exists another constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) &\geqslant c \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\widehat{\alpha}_n}} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(t) - \Psi_0(t))^2 dt \\ &\geqslant c \int_{\underline{c}+v_n}^{\overline{c}-v_n} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(t) - \Psi_0(t))^2 dt \qquad (8.61)\end{aligned}$$

with probability that tends to one, using the definition of v_n and $\widehat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0 = O_p(n^{-1/3})$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) &\leqslant 2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\widehat{\Psi}_n(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x) - \Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x) - \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x)\end{aligned}$$

where by Theorem 4.1, the first integral on the right hand side is of order $O_p(n^{-2/3})$. For the second integral, denoting by K an upper bound for the sup-norm of Ψ_0' on $\mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} (\Psi_0(\alpha_0^T x) - \Psi_0(\widehat{\alpha}_n^T x))^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) &\leqslant K \int_{\mathcal{X}} ((\alpha_0 - \widehat{\alpha}_n)^T x)^2 d\mathbb{Q}(x) \\ &\leqslant K \|\alpha_0 - \alpha_n\|^2 R^2 = O_p(n^{-2/3})\end{aligned}$$

where R is taken from (4.19). Combining, we conclude that (5.24) holds. This proves the second result. □

8.6. Some properties of exponential families

Proposition 8.1. *Let Y be an integrable random variable having a density with respect to a dominating measure λ on $\mathbb{R}$ of the form*

$$y \mapsto h(y, \phi) \exp\left\{\frac{y\ell(\mu) - B(\ell(\mu))}{\phi}\right\} \qquad (8.62)$$

where μ is the mean, ϕ is a dispersion parameter, ℓ is a real valued function with a strictly positive first derivative on a non void open interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, and h is a normalizing function. We then have

1. *B is infinitely differentiable with $B' = \ell^{-1}$ on $(\ell(a), \ell(b))$, and ℓ is infinitely differentiable.*
2. *If $\ell(\mu)$ belongs to a compact interval wich is stricly included in the domain of B, then we can find positive numbers a_0 and M that depend only on that compact interval such that $E|Y|^s \leqslant a_0 s! M^{s-2}$ for all integers $s \geqslant 1$.*

Proof. Setting $\eta = \ell(\mu)$, the density takes the form

$$y \mapsto h(y, \phi) \exp\left\{\frac{y\eta - B(\eta)}{\phi}\right\}.$$

Since it integrates to one with respect to the dominating measure λ, we have

$$\exp\left\{\frac{B(\eta)}{\phi}\right\} = \int h(y, \phi) \exp\left\{\frac{y\eta}{\phi}\right\} d\lambda(y)$$

for all $\eta \in (\ell(a), \ell(b))$. It follows from standard properties of the Laplace transform that the right-hand side of the previous display is infinitely differentiable as a function of η on $\mathbb{R}$, so we conclude that B is infinitely differentiable on $(\ell(a), \ell(b))$. Moreover, we can differentiate and interchange derivation and integration to obtain that on $(\ell(a), \ell(b))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \exp\left\{\frac{B(\eta)}{\phi}\right\} &= \int h(y, \phi) \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \exp\left\{\frac{y\eta}{\phi}\right\} d\lambda(y) \\
&= \int h(y, \phi) \frac{y}{\phi} \exp\left\{\frac{y\eta}{\phi}\right\} d\lambda(y) \\
&= \frac{E(Y)}{\phi} \exp\left\{\frac{B(\eta)}{\phi}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $E(Y) = B'(\eta)$. Going back to the parameter $\mu = E(Y)$, we conclude that $\mu = B'(\ell(\mu))$ for all $\mu \in (a, b)$, whence $B' = \ell^{-1}$. This proves the first assertion.

To prove the second assertion, note that with again $\eta = \ell(\mu)$ we have

$$E\left[\exp\{tY\}\right] = \int h(y, \phi) \exp\left\{ty + \frac{y\eta - B(\eta)}{\phi}\right\} d\lambda(y)$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Now, denote by $[c, d]$ the compact interval to which η is assumed to belong. Because this interval is strictly included in the domain of B, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $[c - \varepsilon, d + \varepsilon]$ is included in the domain of B. With $t = \pm\varepsilon/\phi$, using the fact that the density in the exponential family with natural parameter $\eta + \phi t$ integrates to one, we obtain

$$E\left[\exp\{tY\}\right] = \exp\left\{\frac{B(\eta + \phi t) - B(\eta)}{\phi}\right\}. \tag{8.63}$$

Choosing $t = \varepsilon/\phi$ we conclude that

$$E\left[\exp\{t|Y|\}\right] \leqslant \exp\left\{\frac{B(\eta + \phi t) - B(\eta)}{\phi}\right\} + \exp\left\{\frac{B(\eta - \phi t) - B(\eta)}{\phi}\right\}$$

where the left-hand side is bounded uniformly in η since B is continuous on $[c - \varepsilon, d + \varepsilon]$. In the sequel, we denote by C a positive number that is greater than the right-hand side for all $\eta \in [c, d]$. Since

$$E\left[\exp\{t|Y|\}\right] = \sum_{k \geqslant 0} \frac{t^k E|Y|^k}{k!} \geqslant \frac{t^s E|Y|^s}{s!}$$

for all $s \geqslant 0$, we conclude that $E|Y|^s \leqslant a_0 s! M^{s-2}$ for all integers $s \geqslant 1$, where $a_0 = C/t^2$ and $M = 1/t$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 8.1. □

8.7. Proofs for Subsection 5.2

Lemma 8.2. *Let X be a random variable having a density function q with respect to Lebesgue measure on a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and let α_n be a non-random sequence in $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ that converges to some α_0 as $n \to \infty$. If q is continuous and bounded on its domain, we then have*

$$E[X|\alpha_n^T X] \quad \longrightarrow \quad E[X|\alpha_0^T X]$$

with probability one, as $n \to \infty$.

Proof. In the following, $\alpha_{0,j}$ and $\alpha_{n,j}$ denotes the j-th component of α_0 and α_n respectively. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\alpha_{0,1} \neq 0$, and hence $\alpha_{n,1} \neq 0$ provided that n is large enough. Consider the transformation $Z_1 = \alpha_n^T X$ and $Z_j = X_j,\ j \in \{2, \ldots, d\}$. Let $Z = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_d)$. Simple calculations show that the density of Z is given by

$$f_Z(z) = q\left(\frac{z_1 - \alpha_{n,2} z_2 - \ldots - \alpha_{n,d} z_d}{\alpha_{n,1}}, z_2, \ldots, z_d\right) \frac{1}{\alpha_{n,1}}.$$

This yields the density of the conditional distribution of X_j given that $\alpha_n^T X = t$, $h_{nj}(x_j|t)$, for $j \in \{2, \ldots, d\}$:

$$h_{nj}(x_j|t) = \frac{\int q\left(\frac{t - \alpha_{n,2}\ z_2 - \ldots - \alpha_{n,d}\ z_d}{\alpha_{n,1}}, z_2, \ldots, z_{j-1}, x_j, z_{j+1} \ldots, z_d\right) dz_2 \ldots dz_{j-1} dz_{j+1} \ldots dz_d}{\int q\left(\frac{t - \alpha_{n,2}\ z_2 - \ldots - \alpha_{n,d}\ z_d}{\alpha_{n,1}}, z_2, \ldots, z_d\right) dz_2 \ldots dz_d}.$$

where the domains of integrations in the numerator and denominator are $\{(x_2, \ldots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_d) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ and $\{(x_2, \ldots, x_d) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ respectively. This in turn gives

$$E[X_j|\alpha_n^T X] = \int x_j h_{nj}(x_j|\alpha_n^T X) dx_j.$$

Using convergence of α_n to α_0 and the assumptions on q, it follows that $h_{nj}(x_j|t)$ converges to $h_{0j}(x_j|t)$ for all t, where $h_{0j}(\cdot|t)$ is defined in the same manner as $h_{nj}(\cdot|t)$ with α_n replaced by α_0. Hence, $h_{0j}(\cdot|t)$ is the conditional density of X_j given that $\alpha_0^T X = t$. Using again the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, since X is supported on a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, we then have that

$$E[X_j|\alpha_n^T X] \to E[X_j|\alpha_0^T X]$$

almost surely for all $j \in \{2, \ldots, d\}$. For $j = 1$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} E[X_1|\alpha_n^T X] &= \frac{1}{\alpha_{n,1}}\left(\alpha_n^T X - \sum_{j=2}^d \alpha_{n,j} E[X_j|\alpha_n^T X]\right) \\ &\to \frac{1}{\alpha_{0,1}}\left(\alpha_0^T X - \sum_{j=2}^d \alpha_{0,j} E[X_j|\alpha_0^T X]\right) = E[X_1|\alpha_0^T X] \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □